arXiv:alg-geom/9311013v1 30 Nov 1993

REMARKS ON EIN-LAZARSFELD CRITERION OF SPANNEDNESS OF ADJOINT BUNDLES OF POLARIZED THREEFOLD

Takao FUJITA

Introduction

Let L be an ample line bundle on a smooth complex projective variety M of dimension n. We conjecture that $K + nL$ is spanned unless $L^n = 1$, where K is the canonical bundle of M. In this paper we prove this conjecture for $n = 3$.

For $n = 2$, the conjecture follows easily from Reider's theory [**R**]. In higher dimensions, after the notable works [**Kol**] and [**Dem**], a breakthrough has been achieved by [**EL**] in case $n = 3$. They proved, among others, the following criterion:

Let B be a nef and big line bundle on a smooth 3-fold M, and let x be a point on M. Suppose that
$BC \geq 3$ for any curve C in M with $C \ni x$,
$B^2S \geq 7$ for any irreducible surface S in M with $S \ni x$, and
$B^3 \geq 92$.
Then $x \notin \mathrm{Bs}|K + B|$, i.e., $K + B$ is spanned at x.

The spannedness of $K+3L$ follows from this when $L^4 \geq 4$. Moreover, with some additional techniques, they proved that $K + 4L$ is always spanned.

The purpose of this paper is to show that the above criterion holds true even if the last assumtion $B^3 \geq 92$ is replaced by $B^3 \geq 51$. For the proof we use the same techniques as in [**EL**]. Our argument starts from the following

Theorem 0. *Let M, B, x be as above, let $\pi_1 : M_1 \longrightarrow M$ be the blow-up at x, let E be the exceptional divisor of it and let σ_1, σ_2, σ_3 be positive rational numbers such that*

$$\sigma_2 \geq \mathrm{Max}(\frac{2\sigma_3}{\sigma_3 - 1}, \frac{\sqrt{2}\sigma_3}{\sigma_3 - 2}), \quad \sigma_1 \geq \mathrm{Max}(\frac{2\sigma_3}{\sigma_3 - 1}, \frac{\sigma_3}{\sigma_3 - 3}), \quad \sigma_3 > 3.$$

Suppose that $BC > \sigma_1$ for any curve $C \ni x$, $B^2S > \sigma_2^2$ for any surface $S \ni x$ and that $\pi_1^*B - \sigma_3 E$ is big. Then $K + B$ is spanned at x.

In their Theorem 1^* in [**EL**], they assumed $B^3 > \sigma_3^3$ instead of the bigness of $\pi_1^*B - \sigma_3 E$. The bigness follows from this assumption, but thereafter this is never used. Thus, [**EL**] proves our Theorem 0 implicitly.

We will apply Theorem 0 for $\sigma_1 = 3$, $\sigma_2 = \sqrt{7}$ and $\sigma_3 = \frac{9}{2}$. It suffices to show that the bigness follows from $B^3 \geq 51$, if $K + B$ is not spanned at x. To this end, we need an estimate of the rank of the restriction map $H^0(M_1, s\pi_1^*B - jE) \longrightarrow H^0(E, \mathcal{O}_E(j))$. Of course $\leq h^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}(j)) = (j + 1)(j + 2)/2$, which is enough when $B^3 > \sigma_3^3 = 91.125$. However, when $K + B$ is not spanned at x, we get a sharper bound by a careful quantitative analysis, which yields the bigness of $\pi_1^*B - \frac{9}{2}E$ in case $B^3 \geq 51$.

This paper is organized as follows. In §1, we describe the basic situation and fix notation. §2 and §3 are devoted to the method for giving the above mentioned estimate. In §4 we complete

Needless to say, I benefited very much by reading the preprints [**EL**], [**Dem**], [**Kol**], [**T**]. I would like to express my hearty thanks to the authors, especially to Professors Ein and Lazarsfeld.

§1. Basic observations

(1.1) Usually we follow the customary notation in modern algebraic geometry, and that in [**EL**].

A line bundle L on a variety V is said to be *big* if $\kappa(L) = n = \dim V$, i.e., $h^0(V, tL)$ is a function in t of the growth order t^n when $t \longrightarrow \infty$.

The integral part of a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D will be denoted by $\mathrm{Int}(D)$. Thus $D - \mathrm{Int}(D)$ is the fractional part.

For $i = 1, 2$, let D_i be a prime Weil divisor on a normal variety V_i which is birational to V. Such pairs (V_i, D_i) determine the same discrete valuation of the function field of V if and only if there exist another model $\tilde{V}$ with birational morphisms $f_i : \tilde{V} \longrightarrow V_i$ and a prime divisor $\tilde{D}$ on $\tilde{V}$ such that $f_i(\tilde{D}) = D_i$. Letting $(V_1, D_1) \sim (V_2, D_2)$ in such cases, $\sim$ is an equivalence relation. An equivalence class with respect to $\sim$ will be called a *place* of V. The place represented by such a pair (V, D) will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}(V, D)$ or simply by $\mathcal{P}(D)$.

For a place P of V, take a representative pair (V', D') such that $\pi : V' \longrightarrow V$ is a morphism. The image $Z = \pi(D')$ is independent of the choice of the pair, so it will be called the *locus* of P on V. We say also that P lies over the locus Z.

For a subvariety Z of V not contained in the singular locus of V, let V' be the blowing-up of V along Z and let E_Z be the exceptional divisor over Z. The place $\mathcal{P}(E_Z)$ will be called the primary place over Z.

(1.2) Let $P = \mathcal{P}(V', D')$ be a place of a variety V as above. For a Weil divisor D, let $v_P(D)$ denote the coefficient of D' in f^*D. For $\psi \in H^0(V, L)$, we set $v_P(\psi) = v_P(D_\psi)$, where D_ψ is the member of $|L|$ corresponding to ψ. Here we set $v_P(\psi) = +\infty$ by convention when $\psi = 0$.

A linear system Λ on V can be identified with a linear subspace $V(\Lambda)$ of $H^0(V, L)$. We set $v_P(\Lambda) = \mathrm{Min}_{\psi \in V(\Lambda)}\{v_P(\psi)\}$. For a place Q of a subvariety W of V, we set $v_Q(\Lambda) = v_Q(\Lambda_W)$, where Λ_W is the linear system corresponding to the image of $V(\Lambda)$ via the restriction map $H^0(V, L) \longrightarrow H^0(W, L_W)$. Similarly we define $v_Q(\psi) = v_Q(\psi_W)$ and $v_Q(D) = v_Q(D_W)$. In particular, for an effective divisor D, $v_Q(D) = +\infty$ if and only if $W \subset D$.

We set $\Xi_Q(L) = \mathrm{Inf}_{t>0}\{v_Q(|tL|)/t\}$, which will be called the *algebraic Lelong number* of L at Q. We have $\Xi_Q(L_W) \leq \Xi_Q(L)$, but the equality does not hold in general, since $H^0(V, tL) \longrightarrow H^0(W, tL_W)$ is not always surjective. When Q is the primary place over Z, $\Xi_Q(L)$ is sometimes denoted by $\Xi_Z(L)$.

Clearly we have $\Xi_Q(mL) = m\Xi_Q(L)$ for any positive integer m. Hence, for any $\mathbb{Q}$-bundle F, $\Xi_Q(F)$ is well-defined in a natural way. Since $\Xi_Q(m_1L_1 + m_2L_2) \leq m_1\Xi_Q(L_1) + m_2\Xi_Q(L_2)$ for any positive integers m_1, m_2, $\Xi_Q(F)$ is a convex function in $F \in \mathrm{Pic}(V) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$.

(1.3) Now we consider a situation as in the introduction. B is a nef and big line bundle on a smooth 3-fold M, x is a point on M and $BC \geq 3$ for any curve $C \ni x$, $B^2S \geq 7$ for any surface $S \ni x$ and $d = B^3 \geq 51$. Let $\pi_1 : M_1 \longrightarrow M$ be the blow-up at x and let E be the exceptional divisor over x. Then $h^0(M_1, s\pi_1^*B - tE) - h^0(M_1, s\pi_1^*B - (t+1)E) \leq h^0(E, \mathcal{O}(t)) = (t+1)(t+2)/2$, so $h^0(M_1, s\pi_1^*B - smE) \geq h^0(M_1, s\pi_1^*B) - \sum_{t=0}^{sm-1}(t+1)(t+2)/2 = h^0(M, sB) - sm(sm+1)(sm+2)/6$. Since $h^0(M, sB)$ grows like $ds^3/6$ when $s \longrightarrow \infty$, we infer that $\pi_1^*B - mE$ is big if $d > m^3$, in particular if $m = 3$.

Now we have:

(1.4) *There is a positive integer σ such that $\kappa(|\sigma(\sigma^*B - 3E)|) = 0$*

Indeed, since $|a(\pi_1^*B - 3E)| \neq \emptyset$ for some $a > 0$, we have $v_E(|a\pi_1^*B - wE|) = 0$ for some $w \geq 3a$. On the other hand, B is almost base point free in the sense of Goodman (cf. [**F**;(6.13)]), so $v_E(|\ell\pi_1^*B - \delta E|) = 0$ for some $\ell, \delta > 0$ with $3\ell > \delta$. Then $v_E(|L|) = 0$ for $L = (3\ell - \delta)(a\pi_1^*B - wE) + (w - 3a)(\ell\pi_1^*B - \delta E) = (w\ell - a\delta)(\pi_1^*B - 3E)$, so $\tau = w\ell - a\delta$ has the desired property.

Take a sufficiently large integer τ as above. Then we have a birational morphism $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{M} \longrightarrow M_1$ satisfying the following conditions:
(1) The moving part H of $\Lambda = \tilde{\pi}^*|\tau(\pi_1^*B - 3E)|$ has no base point and $H^3 > 0$.
(2) Let F be the fixed part of Λ and let R be the ramification divisor of $\pi = \pi_1 \circ \tilde{\pi} : \tilde{M} \longrightarrow M$. Then $F + R$ is supported on a simple normal crossing divisor.

Such a decomposition $\Lambda = F + |H|$ will be called a Hironaka decomposition (or model) of degree τ. There are many such decompositions of various degrees. The choice of the degree will be made precise later, so that some additional conditions are satisfied.

(1.5) In the above situation, let $R = \sum_j a_j F_j$ and $\tau^{-1}F + 3\tilde{\pi}^*E = \sum_j \nu_j F_j$, where F_j's are prime components of $F + R$. Sometimes a_j (resp. ν_j) will be denoted by $a(F_j)$ (resp. $\nu(F_j)$). Put $c(F_j) = c_j = (a_j + 1)/\nu_j$ for each j.

Let F_0 be the proper transform of E. Then $\nu_0 = \tau^{-1}v_{F_0}(F) + 3v_{F_0}(\tilde{\pi}^*E) = 3$ by (1.4) and $a_0 = 2$, hence $c_0 = 1$.

Suppose that there is a component F_j such that $c_j \leq 1$ and $F_j \cap F_0 \neq \emptyset$. The place of E represented by $(F_0, F_0 \cap F_j)$ will be called a *bad place* from now on.

(1.6) If there is no bad place as above, set $\sum_j(\nu_j - a_j)F_j = P - N + \Delta$, where Δ is the fractional part of the left hand side and P, N are effective divisors without common components. By Kawamata-Viehweg's vanishing theorem $H^1(\tilde{M}, \pi^*(K + B) - P + N) = 0$, since $\pi^*(K + B) - P + N - \tilde{K} - \Delta = \tau^{-1}H$ is nef and big. Since $\nu_0 - a_0 = 1$, $P' = P - Z$ is effective. Moreover P' does not meet F_0 by the assumption.

On the other hand, any component F_j of N is π-exceptional since $a_j > 0$. Hence, argueing similarly as in the case [**EL**;(4.1)], we infer that the restriction map $H^0(\tilde{M}, \pi^*(K + B) - P') \longrightarrow H^0(F_0, \pi^*(K + B)_{F_0} - P'_{F_0}) \cong \mathbb{C}$ is surjective.

This implies $x \notin \mathrm{Bs}|K + B|$ and we are done in this case.

(1.7) When there is a bad place $P = \mathcal{P}(F_0 \cap F_j)$, set $\nu'_j = v_{F_j}(\tilde{\pi}^*E)$ and $\nu''_j = v_{F_j}(\tau^{-1}F)$. Then $\nu_j = 3\nu'_j + \nu''_j$. Hence $1 \geq c_i$ implies $a_i + 1 \leq \nu_i = 3\nu'_i + \nu''_i$.

Let R_0 be the ramification divisor of the map $F_0 \longrightarrow E$. Then $R_0 = \sum_j a_j F_j + F_0 - 3\tilde{\pi}^*E$ in $\mathrm{Pic}(F_0)$, so $v_P(R_0) = a_i - 3\nu'_i \leq \nu''_i - 1$. We divide the cases according to the nature of the place P.

§2. The case of non-exceptional place

(2.1) Let things be as in (1.7) and suppose that the locus of P on $E \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ is a curve. In this case $v_P(R_0) = 0$, so $\nu''_i \geq 1$.

Assume that $\Xi_P(\pi_1^*B - 3E) < 1$. Then, by the definition of algebraic Lelong number, there is a multiple τ' of τ such that $v_P(F')/\tau' < 1$ for the fixed part F' of $\tilde{\pi}'^*|\tau'(\pi_1^*B - 3E)|$ on $\tilde{M}'$. Replacing the Hironaka decomposition by another one of degree τ', we obtain $\nu''_i < 1$, and we can get rid of such a situation. Therefore we assume $\Xi_P(\pi_1^*B - 3E) \geq 1$ here.

(2.2) For each rational number $x > 0$, put $\xi(x) = \Xi_P(\pi_1^*B - xE)$; here put $\xi(x) = +\infty$ if $\kappa(\pi_1^*B - xE) < 0$. This is a convex function in x, so $\xi(x) \geq \eta_\lambda(x) =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathrm{Max}(\lambda(x - 3) + 1, 0)$ for some $\lambda \geq \frac{1}{3}$.

Let us now consider the restriction map $\rho_{s,j} : H^0(M_1, s\pi_1^*B - jE) \longrightarrow H^0(E, \mathcal{O}_E(j))$. For any $\psi \in \mathrm{Im}(\rho_{s,j})$, we have $v_P(\psi) \geq s\xi(\frac{j}{s})$ by the definition of ξ. Hence $\mathrm{rank}(\rho_{s,j}) \leq$

(2.3) Before proceeding further, we set
$d_1(s,m,\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{sm-1} \frac{1}{s} = m$,
$d_2(s,m,\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{sm-1} \frac{3}{2}(\frac{j}{s} - \eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s}))\frac{1}{s}$ and
$d_3(s,m,\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{sm-1} \frac{1}{2}(\frac{j}{s} - \eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s}))^2\frac{1}{s}$.
Here, sm is not always an integer, under the following convention: Given a sequence $x_0, x_1, \cdots$ and a real number $r \geq 0$, we set $\sum_{j=0}^{r} =_{\text{def}} \sum_{j=0}^{n} x_j + (r-n)x_{n+1}$, where $n = \text{Int}(r)$. Thus, the above $d_i(s,m,\lambda)$'s are continuous functions in s, m and λ.

Note that $\sum_{j=0}^{sm-1}(1+j-s\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s}))(2+j-s\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s}))/2 = \sum_{i=1}^{3} d_i(s,m,\lambda)s^i$ and
$\lim_{s\to\infty} d_2(s,m,\lambda) = \int_0^m \frac{3}{2}(x-\eta_\lambda(x))dx$, $\quad \lim_{s\to\infty} d_3(s,m,\lambda) = \int_0^m \frac{1}{2}(x-\eta_\lambda(x))^2dx$.

(2.4) Now we divide the cases according to the values of λ.

1) The case $\lambda \leq \frac{7}{3}$. We have $\eta_\lambda(\frac{9}{2}) \leq \frac{9}{2}$. Therefore $h^0(M,sB) - h^0(M, s(\pi_1^*B - \frac{9}{2}E)) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{9}{2}s-1} \text{rank}(\rho_{s,j}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{3} d_i(s,\frac{9}{2},\lambda)s^i$ by the above argument. We have

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} 6d_3(s,\tfrac{9}{2},\lambda) = \int_0^{\frac{9}{2}} 3(x-\eta_\lambda(x))^2dx = \int_0^{3-\frac{1}{\lambda}} 3x^2dx + \int_{3-\frac{1}{\lambda}}^{\frac{9}{2}} 3(x-\lambda(x-3)-1)^2dx =$$
$$\frac{1}{\lambda-1}\left\{\frac{(3\lambda-1)^3}{\lambda^2} - \left(\frac{7-3\lambda}{2}\right)^3\right\}.$$

Let $g(\lambda)$ be this function. Then by computation we get $g'(\lambda) = \frac{(3\lambda-1)}{4\lambda^3}h(\lambda)$ for $h(\lambda) = 9\lambda^3 - 24\lambda^2 - 8\lambda + 8$. We have $h'(\lambda) = 27\lambda^2 - 48\lambda - 8$ and $h''(\lambda) = 54\lambda - 48$. In the interval $I = \{\frac{1}{3} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{7}{3}\}$, h'' changes the sign at $\lambda = \frac{8}{9}$, while $h'(\frac{1}{3}) < 0$ and $h'(\frac{7}{3}) > 0$. Hence $h'(\lambda)$ changes the sign at some λ_0 with $\frac{8}{9} < \lambda_0 < \frac{7}{3}$. Actually $\lambda_0 = \frac{8+2\sqrt{22}}{9}$, but we do not need this explicit value.

Any way we have $h(\frac{1}{3}) = 3 > 0$ and $h(\frac{7}{3}) = -27 < 0$, so $h(\lambda_0) < 0$. Hence $h(\lambda)$ changes the sign at some λ_1 between $\frac{1}{3}$ and λ_0. Therefore $g(\lambda)$ attains the maximum at $\lambda = \lambda_1$.

By computation we have $h(0.464) > 0 > h(0.465)$, so $0.464 < \lambda_1 < 0.465$, hence $g(\lambda) <$
$$\frac{1}{1-0.465}\left\{\left(\frac{7-3\times 0.464}{2}\right)^3 - \frac{(3\times 0.464-1)^3}{(0.465)^2}\right\} < 40.69.$$

Thus we have $\lim_{s\to\infty} 6d_3(s,\frac{9}{2},\lambda) < 41$ for any $\frac{1}{3} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{7}{3}$, while $h^0(M,sB)$ grows like $ds^3/6$ with $d = B^3 \geq 51$. Hence $h^0(M_1, s(\pi_1^*B - \frac{9}{2}E)) = O(s^3)$, i.e., $\kappa(\pi_1^*B - \frac{9}{2}E) = 3$ as desired.

2) The case $\lambda > \frac{7}{3}$. Set $T = \text{Inf}\{t \in \mathbb{Q} | \kappa(\pi_1^*B - tE) < 0\}$ and $T_0 = (3\lambda-1)/(\lambda-1)$. Since $\xi(t) \leq t$ if $\kappa(\pi_1^*B - tE) \geq 0$, we have $T \leq T_0 < \frac{9}{2}$, since $\eta_\lambda(t) \leq t$ iff $t \leq T_0$.

We have $\lim_{s\to\infty} 6d_3(s,T_0,\lambda) \leq \int_0^{3-\frac{1}{\lambda}} 3x^2dx + \int_{3-\frac{1}{\lambda}}^{T_0} 3(x-\lambda(x-3)-1)^2dx$. This right side $g(\lambda)$ is $(3\lambda-1)^3/(\lambda-1)\lambda^2$, so $\frac{d}{d\lambda}\log g(\lambda) = \frac{9}{3\lambda-1} - \frac{1}{\lambda-1} - \frac{2}{\lambda} = \frac{-2}{(3\lambda-1)(\lambda-1)\lambda} < 0$, hence $g(\lambda) \leq g(\frac{7}{3}) < 29.8$. Therefore $\lim_{s\to\infty} 6d_3(s,m,\lambda) < 30$ for any m such that $m - T_0$ is small enough.

If $T \in \mathbb{Q}$, set $m = T \leq T_0$. Then we have $\sum_{j=0}^{sm-1} \text{rank}(\rho_{s,j}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{3} d_i(s,m,\lambda)s^i$ for any $s \gg 0$ and hence $\kappa(\pi_1^*B - mE) = 3$. But then $\kappa(\pi_1^*B - tE) > 0$ for any t slightly larger than $m = T$, contradicting the choice of T.

If $T < T_0$, we take a rational number m such that $T < m < T_0$. Then $\kappa(\pi_1^*B - mE) = 3$ similarly as above, contradiction.

It remains the case $T = T_0 \notin \mathbb{Q}$. By similar computations as above, we infer that there are a small positive number ϵ and a very large number ℓ such that $h^0(M,sB) > \sum_{i=1}^{3} d_i(s,m,\lambda)s^i$

in (2.3). For an integer $s \geq \mathrm{Max}(\ell, \frac{1}{\epsilon})$, let q be the least integer such that $q/s > T$, and set $m = q/s$. Then $\sum_{j=0}^{sm-1} \mathrm{rank}(\rho_{s,j}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{3} d_i(s,m,\lambda)s^i < h^0(M, sB)$, so $h^0(s\pi_1^*B - smE) > 0$, contradicting $m > T$.

(2.5) Combining these observations, we conclude that $\pi_1^*B - \frac{9}{2}E$ is big unless we can get rid of non-exceptional places by replacing the degree of the Hironaka decomposition as in (2.1).

§3. The case of exceptional place

In this section we consider the cases where the locus of the bad place P on E is a point.

(3.1) As a warm-up, we first consider the case where P is the primary place over a point y on E. Thus $P = \mathcal{P}(E_1, Y_1)$ where Y_1 is the (-1)-curve on the blow-up E_1 of E at y.

(3.1.1) We have seen $\nu_P'' - 1 \geq v_P(R_{F_0/E}) = v_P(R_{E_1/E}) = 1$ in (1.7). Hence, as in §2, we can get rid of this situation by replacing the degree of the Hironaka model when $\Xi_P(\pi_1^*B - 3E) < 2$. Therefore we may assume that $\Xi_P(\pi_1^*B - 3E) \geq 2$.

(3.1.2) Set $\xi(t) = \Xi_P(\pi_1^*B - tE)$ for $t \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then, as in §2, $\xi(t)$ is a convex function in t with $\xi(3) \geq 2$, so $\xi(t) \geq \eta_\lambda(t) =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathrm{Max}(\lambda(t-3)+2, 0)$ for some $\lambda \geq \frac{2}{3}$.

(3.1.3) Set $h(u,w) = h^0(E_1, uH - wY_1)$, where H is the pull-back of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ on $E \cong \mathbb{P}^2$. Then we have $h(u,w) = \frac{1}{2}(u+1)(u+2) - \frac{1}{2}(w+1)w$ if $u \geq w$, and $h(u,w) = 0$ if $u < w$.

(3.1.4) Let $\rho_{s,j} : H^0(M_1, s\pi_1^*B - jE) \longrightarrow H^0(E, \mathcal{O}_E(j)) \cong H^0(E_1, jH)$ be the natural map. By the definition of Ξ_P, we have $\mathrm{rank}(\rho_{s,j}) \leq h(j,w)$ for some $w \geq s\xi(\frac{j}{s})$, so
$\mathrm{rank}(\rho_{s,j}) \leq \frac{1}{2}(j+1)(j+2) - \frac{1}{2}s\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s})(s\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s})+1)$ if $\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s}) \leq \frac{j}{s}$.
Hence $h^0(M, sB) - h^0(M_1, s\pi_1^*B - smE) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{sm-1} \mathrm{rank}(\rho_{s,j}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{3} d_i(s,m,\lambda)s^i$, where we set
$d_1(s,m,\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{sm-1} \frac{1}{s} = m$,
$d_2(s,m,\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{sm-1} (\frac{3}{2}\frac{j}{s} - \frac{1}{2}\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s}))\frac{1}{s}$ and
$d_3(s,m,\lambda) = \sum_{j=0}^{sm-1} (\frac{1}{2}(\frac{j}{s})^2 - \frac{1}{2}\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s})^2)\frac{1}{s}$.
When $s \longrightarrow \infty$, we have $d_2(s,m,\lambda) \longrightarrow \int_0^m (\frac{3}{2}x - \frac{1}{2}\eta_\lambda(x))dx$ and
$d_3(s,m,\lambda) \longrightarrow \int_0^m (\frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{2}\eta_\lambda(x)^2)dx$.

(3.1.5) As in §2, we divide the cases according to λ.

(3.1.5.1) Suppose that $\lambda \leq \frac{5}{3}$. Then $\eta_\lambda(\frac{9}{2}) \leq \frac{9}{2}$. In this case we can apply the above argument for $m = \frac{9}{2}$. We have $\lim_{s\to\infty} 6d_3(s, \frac{9}{2}, \lambda) = \int_0^{\frac{9}{2}} 3(x^2 - \eta_\lambda(x)^2)dx = \int_0^{3-\frac{2}{\lambda}} 3x^2dx + \int_{3-\frac{2}{\lambda}}^{\frac{9}{2}} 3(x^2 - (\lambda(x-3)+2)^2)dx = (\frac{9}{2})^3 - (\frac{3}{2}\lambda+2)^3/\lambda$. Set $g(\lambda) = (\frac{3}{2}\lambda+2)^3/\lambda$. Then $\frac{d}{d\lambda}\log g(\lambda) = \frac{9}{3\lambda+4} - \frac{1}{\lambda} = (6\lambda-4)/(3\lambda+4)\lambda > 0$ in the range $\lambda > \frac{2}{3}$. Hence $g(\lambda) \geq g(\frac{2}{3}) = \frac{81}{2}$ if $\lambda \geq \frac{2}{3}$, so $\lim_{s\to\infty} 6d_3(s, \frac{9}{2}, \lambda) \leq (\frac{9}{2})^3 - \frac{81}{2} = 50.625 < 51 \leq d = B^3$. By similar argument as in §2, we infer $\kappa(\pi_1^*B - \frac{9}{2}E) = 3$ in this case.

Remark. The above number 50.625 is the reason why we assume $d \geq 51$ in the Main Theorem.

(3.1.5.2) Suppose that $\lambda > \frac{5}{3}$. Then $\eta_\lambda(T_0) = T_0$ for $T_0 = (3\lambda-2)/(\lambda-1) < \frac{9}{2}$. We have $\int_0^{T_0} 3(x^2 - \eta_\lambda(x)^2)dx = (\frac{3\lambda-2}{\lambda-1})^3 - \frac{1}{\lambda}(\frac{3\lambda-2}{\lambda-1})^3 = (3\lambda-2)^3/\lambda(\lambda-1)^2$, which we set $g(\lambda)$. Then $\frac{d}{d\lambda}\log g(\lambda) = \frac{9}{3\lambda-2} - \frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{2}{\lambda-1} = -2/(3\lambda-2)\lambda(\lambda-1) < 0$ if $\lambda > \frac{5}{3}$, so $g(\lambda) \leq g(\frac{5}{3}) = 36.45 < 51$. From this we get a contradiction as in (2.4.2).

(3.2) As a second warm-up, we consider the case where P is a secondary place over y. This means that P is the primary place over a point y_2 on the (-1)-curve Y_1 on E_1. Let Y_2 be the (-1)-curve over y_2 on the blow-up E_2 of E_1, so $P = \mathcal{P}(E_2, Y_2)$.

(3.2.1) In this case we have $\nu_P'' - 1 \geq v_P(R_{E_2/E}) = 2$, so we may assume $\Xi_P(\pi_1^*B - 3E) \geq 3$ as in (3.1.1). Hence $\xi(t) = \Xi_P(\pi_1^*B - tE)$ satisfies $\xi(t) \geq \eta_\lambda(t) = \mathrm{Max}(0, \lambda(t-3)+3)$ for some

$\lambda \geq 1$.

(3.2.2) **Lemma.** *Let H be the pull-back of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ on $E \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ to E_2. Set $h^i(u, w_1, w_2) = \dim H^i(E_2, uH - w_1Y_1^* - w_2Y_2)$, where Y_1^* is the total transform of Y_1. Thus the proper transform $\tilde{Y}_1$ is a (-2)-curve on E_2 such that $Y_1^* = \tilde{Y}_1 + Y_2$. Then*
1) $h^0(u, w_1, w_2) = \frac{1}{2}(1+u)(2+u) - \sum_{i=1}^{2} \frac{1}{2}w_i(w_i+1)$ if $u \geq w_1 + w_2$ and $w_1 \geq w_2 \geq 0$.
2) $h^0(u, w_1, w_2) = 0$ if $2u < w$, where $w = w_1 + w_2$.
3) $h^0(u, w_1, w_2) \leq \frac{1}{2}(1+u)(2+u) - \frac{1}{4}w(w+2)$ if $w \leq u$.
4) $h^0(u, w_1, w_2) \leq \frac{1}{4}(2 + 2u - w)^2$ if $u \leq w \leq 2u$.

Proof. We claim $h^1(u, w_1, w_2) = 0$ under the assumption in 1). To prove this, we use the induction on u. The claim is obvious if $w_2 = 0$, so suppose $u \geq w_1 + w_2 > 0$. The unique member Y of $|H - Y_1^* - Y_2|$ is a (-1)-curve, so we have an exact sequence
$H^1(E_2, L(u-1, w_1-1, w_2-1)) \longrightarrow H^1(E_2, L(u, w_1, w_2)) \longrightarrow H^1(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(u - w_1 - w_2))$,
where $L(u, w_1, w_2)$ denotes $uH - w_1Y_1^* - w_2Y_2 \in \mathrm{Pic}(E_2)$. The last term vanishes by the assumption $u \geq w_1 + w_2$, while the first term vanishes by the induction hypothesis. Thus the claim is proved.

From this claim, 1) follows from the Riemann-Roch theorem. 2) is proved similarly by induction on u. Indeed, we have an exact sequence
$H^0(E_2, L(u-1, w_1-1, w_2-1)) \longrightarrow H^0(E_2, L(u, w_1, w_2)) \longrightarrow H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}(u - w_1 - w_2))$,
and the last term vanishes by the assumption $2u < w$.

To show 3), we may assume $w_1 \geq w_2$. Indeed, otherwise, we have an exact sequence
$H^0(E_2, L(u, w_1+1, w_2-1)) \longrightarrow H^0(E_2, L(u, w_1, w_2)) \longrightarrow H^0(\tilde{Y}_1, \mathcal{O}(w_1 - w_2)) = 0$, so we reduce the problem to the case $w_1 \geq w_2$ by the induction on $w_2 - w_1$. When $w_1 \geq w_2$, we can apply 1), and we have $\sum w_i(w_i+1) = \sum((w_i + \frac{1}{2})^2 - \frac{1}{4}) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\sum(w_i + \frac{1}{2}))^2 - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}(w^2 + 2w)$ by Schwarz' inequality. Combining them we get the estimate 3).

To prove 4), we use the induction on $w - u$. We may assume $w_1 \geq w_2$ as above. The assertion follows from 3) for $w - u = 0$. When $w > u$, we use the exact sequence
$H^0(E_2, L(u-1, w_1-1, w_2-1)) \longrightarrow H^0(E_2, L(u, w_1, w_2)) \longrightarrow H^0(Y, \mathcal{O}(u - w_1 - w_2))$.
The last term vanishes by the assumption $w > u$, so the assertion is proved by induction.

(3.2.3) Let $\rho_{s,j}$ be the map $H^0(M_1, s\pi_1^*B - jE) \longrightarrow H^0(E, \mathcal{O}(j)) \cong H^0(E_2, jH)$. By the definition of Ξ we have $v_P(\psi) \geq s\xi(\frac{j}{s})$ for any $\psi \in \mathrm{Im}(\rho_{s,j})$, so $\mathrm{rank}(\rho_{s,j}) \leq h^0(E_2, jH - wY_2)$ for some $w \geq s\xi(\frac{j}{s})$. Hence, by (3.2.2), we have
$\mathrm{rank}(\rho_{s,j}) \leq \frac{1}{2}(1+j)(2+j) - \frac{1}{4}s\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s})(2 + s\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s}))$ if $\frac{j}{s} \geq \xi(\frac{j}{s})$,
$\leq \frac{1}{4}(2 + 2j - s\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s}))^2$ if $\frac{j}{s} \leq \xi(\frac{j}{s}) \leq \frac{2j}{s}$ and
$= 0$ if $\xi(\frac{j}{s}) \geq \frac{2j}{s}$.
According to these estimates, we modify the definition of $d_i(s, m, \lambda)$ in (3.1.4) suitably, and argue as before. This time we have

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} d_3(s, m, \lambda) = \int_{\eta_\lambda(x) \leq x} (\frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{4}\eta_\lambda(x)^2)dx + \int_{x \leq \eta_\lambda(x) \leq 2x} \frac{1}{4}(2x - \eta_\lambda(x))^2 dx$$

.

(3.2.4) As in (3.1.5), we divide the cases according to λ.

(3.2.4.1) $\lambda \leq 4$. In this case the above limit is $\int_0^{3-\frac{3}{\lambda}} \frac{1}{2}x^2dx + \int_{3-\frac{3}{\lambda}}^{3} \{\frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{4}(\lambda(x-3)+3)^2\}dx$
$+ \int_3^{\frac{9}{2}} \frac{1}{4}(2x - \lambda(x-3) - 3)^2 dx = \frac{9}{2} - \frac{9}{4\lambda} + \frac{9}{32}(\lambda^2 - 10\lambda + 28) = \frac{9}{32}(\lambda^2 - 10\lambda + 44 - \frac{8}{\lambda})$ for $m = \frac{9}{2}$.
It is easy to see that this is a decreasing function in λ, so $\leq \frac{243}{32} = 7.59375 < \frac{51}{6}$ in the range $1 \leq \lambda \leq 4$.

(3.2.4.2) $\lambda \geq 4$. In this case $\eta_\lambda(x) \leq 2x$ only if $x \leq T_0 = (3\lambda - 3)/(\lambda - 2)$, and the above limit for $m = T_0$ is $\frac{9}{2}(1 + \frac{1}{(\lambda-2)\lambda})$. This is a decreasing function in λ when $\lambda > 4$, so

(3.2.5) In either case we have the limit $< \frac{51}{6}$, so we are done as in §2 or (3.1).

(3.3) Now we consider the general case. By succesive blow-ups at the loci of P, we get a model $\tilde{E}$ of E together with a divisor D on it such that $P = \mathcal{P}(\tilde{E}, D)$. $(\tilde{E}, D)$ will be called the lowest representative pair of P and we will divide the cases according to its nature.

The blow-up process is essentially the same up to the second step, where the situation is as in (3.2). The locus of P on E_2, the center of the third blow-up, is a point y_3 on the newest (-1)-curve Y_2. There are now two cases: $y_3 = Y_2 \cap \tilde{Y}_1$ or $y_3 \notin \tilde{Y}_1$. In the former case, the (-1)-curve Y_3 over y_3 meets the proper transforms of the other older (-1)-curves at two points, while in the latter case Y_3 meets only $\tilde{Y}_2$ at a point. Thus, also in the subsequent steps, the locus of P is a point on the newest (-1)-curve, which meets the proper transforms of older (-1)-curves at one or two point(s).

The whole process can be described as follows. At first there are several times, say i, of blow-ups at points off the proper transforms of older (-1)-curves. They form a chain as below, where (n) denotes the proper transform of the n-th (-1)-curve.

$$(1) - (2) - \cdots - (i) \tag{1}$$

Next come blow-ups at the meeting point with the proper transform of the oldest (-1)-curve. Call the proper transforms of the (-1)-curves of these steps $(i.2)$, $(i.3)$, $\cdots$, $(i.j)$ and rename (i) as $(i.1)$. The result is a chain as below:

$$(1) - \cdots - (i-1) - (i.j) - (i.j-1) - \cdots - (i.1) \tag{2}$$

Next come blow-ups at the meeting points with $(i.j-1)$ above. Renaming $(i.j)$ as $(i.j.1)$, we get a chain as follows:

$$(1) - \cdots - (i-1) - (i.j.1) - \cdots - (i.j.k) - (i.j-1) - \cdots - (i.1) \tag{3}$$

Similar process will continue unless we blow up at a point off the proper transforms of older (-1)-curves. For example, the next step of the above will be

$$(1) - \cdots - (i-1) - (i.j.1) - \cdots - (i.j.k-1) - (i.j.k.\ell) - \cdots - (i.j.k.1) - (i.j-1) - \cdots - (i.1) \tag{4}$$

Note that i, j, k, ℓ, $\cdots$ are integers ≥ 2.

If we blow-up at a point off the proper transforms of older (-1)-curves, at first the situation is as follows:

$$\vdash -[2] \tag{5}$$

Here $\vdash$ is the union of proper transforms of the older (-1)-curves, and $[2]$ is the newest (-1)-curve. Then comes a similar process as before, and a sample result will be:

$$\vdash -[2] - \cdots - [i'-1] - [i'.j'.1] - \cdots - [i'.j'.k'] - [i'.j'-1] - \cdots - [i'.1] \tag{6}$$

Now comes a blow-up at a point off the proper transforms of older (-1)-curves, followed by a similar process as above, and so on.

After several times we get a pair representing P.

(3.4) Let Λ be the restriction to E of the linear system $|\tau(\pi_1^* B - 3E)|$, where τ is the degree of the Hironaka model. Set $m_1 = \tau^{-1} v_{Y_1}(\Lambda)$. Then $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda|_{E_1} - \tau m_1 Y_1$ on E_1 has no exceptional fixed component. Next set $m_2 = \tau^{-1} v_{Y_2}(\Lambda_1)$. Then $\Lambda_2 = \Lambda_1|_{E_2} - \tau m_2 Y_2$ on E_2 has no exceptional fixed component. We proceed similarly and define m_i and Λ_i. For example, if

$m_{(i.j.k)} = \tau^{-1} v_{Y_{(i.j.k)}}(\Lambda_{(i.j.k-1)})$. Then $\Lambda_{(i.j.k)} = \Lambda_{(i.j.k-1)}|_{E_{(i.j.k)}} - \tau m_{(i.j.k)} Y_{(i.j.k)}$ on $E_{(i.j.k)}$ has no exceptional fixed component. In the same way $m_{[i'.j']}$ etc. are defined.

(3.5) The above numbers $\{m_*\}$ satisfy various inequalities. Suppose for example we are in the situation (3) in (3.3):

$$(1) - \cdots - (i-1) - (i.j.1) - \cdots - (i.j.k) - (i.j-1) - \cdots - (i.1)$$

Then we have
(1) $3 \geq m_{(1)} \geq \cdots \geq m_{(i-1)} \geq m_{(i.1)} + \cdots + m_{(i.j-1)} + m_{(i.j.1)}$.

Indeed, for the proper transform $\tilde{Y}_{(*)}$ of $Y_{(*)}$, we have $0 \leq \Lambda_{(*+1)}\{\tilde{Y}_{(*)}\} = m_{(*)} - m_{(*+1)}$ for each $* = 1, \cdots, i-2$. For $* = i-1$ we get the last inequality from $0 \leq \Lambda_{(i.j.1)}\{Y_{(i-1)}\}$.

Similarly we obtain
(2) $m_{(i.1)} \geq \cdots \geq m_{(i.j-1)} \geq m_{(i.j.1)} + \cdots + m_{(i.j.k)}$.
(3) $m_{(i.j.1)} \geq \cdots \geq m_{(i.j.k)}$.

In the situation (3.3;5), we have $m_0 \geq m_{[2]}$, where m_0 is the m of the (-1)-curve just before $Y_{[2]}$. In case (3.3;6) we have similarly
$m_0 \geq m_{[2]} \geq \cdots \geq m_{[i'-1]} \geq m_{[i'.1]} + \cdots + m_{[i'.j'-1]} + m_{[i'.j'.1]}$.

Probably these samples are enough to understand the general principle.

(3.6) Set $r_* = v_*(R_*)$ for $* = (i), (i.j), \cdots, [i'], \cdots$ etc., where R_* is the ramification divisor of the map $E_* \longrightarrow E$. Then $r_* - 1$ is the sum of $r_\#$'s such that the blow-up center y_* lies on the proper transform of $Y_\#$. In particular, we have
$r_{(n)} = n$ for $n \leq i$,
$r_{(i.n)} = i + (n-1)(r_{(i-1)} + 1) = ni$ for $n \leq j$,
$r_{(i.j.n)} = r_{(i.j)} + (n-1)(r_{(i.j-1)} + 1) = nij - (n-1)(i-1)$ for $n \leq k$,
$r_{(i.j.k.n)} = r_{(i.j.k)} + (n-1)(r_{(i.j.k-1)} + 1) = ijkn - ijn - ikn + ij + nk + 2ni - n - i$,
$\cdots\cdots$
and similarly we can calculate r_* in the general case.

Next set $\mu_* = v_*(\Lambda|_{E_*})$. Then $\mu_* - m_*$ is the sum of $\mu_\#$'s such that the blow-up center y_* lies on the proper transform of $Y_\#$. In particular, we have
$\mu_{(n)} = m_{(1)} + \cdots + m_{(n)}$ for $n \leq i$,
$\mu_{(i.n)} = n\mu_{(i-1)} + m_{(i.1)} + m_{(i.2)} + \cdots + m_{(i.n)}$
$= n(m_{(1)} + \cdots + m_{(i-1)} + m_{(i.1)} + \cdots + m_{(i.n)}$ for $n \leq j$,
$\mu_{(i.j.n)} = n\mu_{(i.j-1)} + \mu_{(i-1)} + m_{(i.j.1)} + \cdots + m_{(i.j.n)}$
$= ((j-1)n+1)(m_{(1)} + \cdots + m_{(i-1)}) + n(m_{(i.1)} + \cdots + m_{(i.j-1)}) + m_{(i.j.1)} + \cdots + m_{(i.j.n)}$
for $n \leq k$,
$\mu_{(i.j.k.n)} = \mu_{(i.j-1)} + n\mu_{(i.j.k-1)} + m_{(i.j.k.1)} + \cdots + m_{(i.j.k.n)}$
$= ((j-1) + n((j-1)(k-1)+1)(m_{(1)} + \cdots + m_{(i-1)}) + (n(k-1)+1)(m_{(i.1)} + \cdots + m_{(i.j-1)}) + n(m_{(i.j.1)} + \cdots + m_{(i.j.k-1)}) + m_{(i.j.k.1)} + \cdots + m_{(i.j.k.n)}$,
$\cdots\cdots$

Now we set $\delta_* = \mu_* - r_*$, which can be calculated as above. Note that μ_* corresponds ν''_* in (1.7), hence $\delta_* \geq 1$ iff P_* is a bad place. Hence we may assume $\delta_* < 1$ for any $*$ except the final one. In particular we may assume $m_{(1)} < 2$.

(3.7) **Lemma.** *Set* $\Delta_{(i.1)} = \delta_{(i.1)} + m_{(i-1)}$, $\Delta_{(i.j.1)} = \delta_{(i.j.1)} + m_{(i.j-1)}$, $\Delta_{(i.j.k.1)} = \delta_{(i.j.k.1)} + m_{(i.j.k-1)}$, $\cdots$, $\Delta_{[i'.1]} = \delta_{[i'.1]} + m_{[i'-1]}$, $\cdots$, *etc. Then* $\Delta_{(i.1)} \geq \Delta_{(i.j.1)} \geq \Delta_{(i.j.k.1)} \geq \cdots \geq \Delta_{[i'.1]} \geq \Delta_{[i'.j'.1]} \geq \cdots \geq 1$.

Proof. We have $\delta_{(i.j.1)} = \delta_{(i.1)} + (j-1)(\delta_{(i-1)} - 1) + m_{(i.2)} + \cdots + m_{(i.j)} \leq \delta_{(i.1)} + m_{(i.2)} + \cdots + m_{(i.j)}$. Hence $\Delta_{(i.j.1)} \leq \delta_{(i.j.1)} + m_{(i.1)} \leq \Delta_{(i.1)}$ by (3.5). Similarly we have $\delta_{(i.j.k.1)} \leq \delta_{(i.j.1)} + m_{(i.j.2)} + \cdots + m_{(i.j.k)}$ and $\Delta_{(i.j.k.1)} \leq \delta_{(i.j.k.1)} + m_{(i.j.1)} \leq \Delta_{(i.j.1)}$, and so

In the situation (6) in (3.3), let Y_0 be the newest (-1)-curve in the part $\vdash$. Then $\Delta_0 \geq \delta_0 + m_0$, $m_0 \geq m_{[i'-1]}$ and $\delta_{[i'.1]} = \delta_0 + \sum_n (m_{[n]} - 1) \leq \delta_0$, so $\Delta_0 \geq \Delta_{[i'.1]}$.

By similar argument we obtain the asserted inequalities. As for the final one, let us consider the case where $Y_{[i'.j'.k']}$ is the final (-1)-curve as in (3.3.6), as a sample. We have $1 \leq \delta_{[i'.j'.k']} = \delta_{[i'.j'.1]} + (k'-1)(\delta_{[i'.j'-1]} - 1) + m_{[i'.j'.2]} + \cdots + m_{[i'.j'.k']} \leq \delta_{[i'.j'.1]} + \sum_n m_{[i'.j'.n]} \leq \Delta_{[i'.j'.1]}$. Other cases can be treated similarly.

Remark. If you define $\Delta_{(i.n)} = \delta_{(i.n)} + m_{(i.n-1)}$ for $n > 1$, then this is not always a decreasing function in n.

(3.8) Let $\Xi_*(\pi_1^* B - 3E)$ (sometimes abbreviated as Ξ_* from now on) be the algebraic Lelong number at the place $P_* = \mathcal{P}(Y_*)$. By definition, this is approximated by μ_* when the degree τ of the Hironaka model is large enough. In the sequel we will show that the bigness of $\pi_1^* B - \frac{9}{2}E$ follows from lower estimates of Ξ_* as in (3.1) and (3.2). But the precise arguments depend on the place P_*.

(3.9) First we consider the case $P_{(n)}$, $1 \leq n \leq i$. Let H be the pull-back of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ on $E \cong \mathbb{P}^2$ to $E_{(n)}$ and let Y_j be the total transform of the (-1)-curve $Y_{(j)}$ on $E_{(n)}$, while the proper transform is denoted by $\tilde{Y}_j$. Thus, $\tilde{Y}_j$ is the unique member of $|Y_j - Y_{j+1}|$ for each $j < n$. Put $L(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) = uH - w_1 Y_1 - \cdots - Y_n \in \mathrm{Pic}(E_{(n)})$, $h^p(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) = \dim H^p(E_{(n)}, L(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n))$ and $w = w_1 + \cdots + w_n$ for non-negative integers $u, w_1, \cdots, w_n$.

Then we have the following

Lemma. *1)* $h^0(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) = 0$ *if* $nu < w$.
2) $h^1(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) = 0$ *and* $h^0(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) = \frac{1}{2}(u+1)(u+2) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_j w_j(w_j+1)$ *if* $u \geq w$ *and if* $w_1 \geq w_2 \geq \cdots \geq w_n$.
3) $h^0(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) \leq \frac{1}{2}(u+1)(u+2) - \frac{1}{2n}w(w+n)$ *if* $u \geq w$.
4) $h^0(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) \leq q(nu - w)$ *if* $u \leq w \leq nu$, *where* $q(\theta) = \dfrac{\theta^2}{2n(n-1)} + \dfrac{\theta}{n-1} + 1$.

Proof. . The point $y_{(2)}$ on Y_1 determines a line Z on E passing the point $y_{(1)}$. Its proper transform $\tilde{Z}$ on $E_{(n)}$ is a member of $|H - Y_1 - \cdots - Y_a|$ for some a with $2 \leq a \leq n$.

To show 1), we use the induction on u. The assertion is obvious when $u = 0$, so suppose $u \geq 1$. If $w_j < w_{j+1}$ for some j, then $L(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n)\tilde{Y}_j < 0$, so $h^0(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) \leq h^0(u, w_1, \cdots, w_j + 1, w_{j+1} - 1, \cdots)$ since
$H^0(L(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) - \tilde{Y}_j) \longrightarrow H^0(L(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n)) \longrightarrow H^0(\tilde{Y}_j, L(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n)|_{Y_j})$
is exact. Therefore it suffices to consider the case $w_1 \geq \cdots \geq w_n$. Then $L(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n)\tilde{Z} = u - w_1 - \cdots - w_a \leq u - a\frac{w}{n} < 0$, so we have $h^0(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) = h^0(L(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) - \tilde{Z} = h^0(u-1, w_1 - 1, \cdots, w_a - 1, w_{a+1}, \cdots, w_n)$. This last term is zero by the induction hypothesis, thus 1) is proved.

We use the induction on u to prove 2) too. It suffices to prove $h^1 = 0$, since the assertion on h^0 follows from this by the Riemann-Roch theorem. The case $u = 0$ is obvious, so suppose $u \geq 1$. By assumption $L(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n)\tilde{Z} = u - w_1 - \cdots - w_a \geq 0$, so $h^1(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) \leq h^1(L(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) - \tilde{Z}) = h^1(u-1, w_1 - 1, \cdots, w_a - 1, w_{a+1}, \cdots)$. If $w_a > w_{a+1}$, this vanishes by the induction hypothesis. If $w_a = w_{a+1}$, we have $L(u-1, \cdots, w_a - 1, w_{a+1}, \cdots)\tilde{Y}_a = -1$ and $H^1(\tilde{Y}_a, \mathcal{O}(-1)) = 0$, hence $h^1(u-1, w_1 - 1, \cdots, w_a - 1, w_{a+1}, \cdots) \leq h^1(u-1, \cdots, w_{a-1} - 1, w_a, w_{a+1} - 1, w_{a+2}, \cdots)$. Now if $w_{a-1} - 1 < w_a$ ($\Leftrightarrow w_{a-1} = w_a$), we proceed similarly by subtracting $\tilde{Y}_{a-1}$ to obtain $\leq h^1(u-1, \cdots, w_{a-2} - 1, w_{a-1}, w_a, w_{a+1} - 1, w_{a+2}, \cdots)$. After several similar steps we get $\leq h^1(u-1, w_1(\text{or } w_1 - 1), \cdots, w_{a+1} - 1, w_{a+2}, \cdots)$ where we have $w_1(\text{or } w_1 - 1) \geq \cdots \geq w_{a+1} - 1$. If $w_{a+1} > w_{a+2}$ we are done by the induction hypothesis. If $w_{a+1} = w_{a+2}$, subtracting $\tilde{Y}_j$'s several times as above, we get $\leq h^1(u-1, w_1(\text{or } w_1 - 1), \cdots, w_{a+2} - 1, w_{a+3}, \cdots)$ such that $w_1(\text{or } w_1 - 1) \geq \cdots \geq w_{a+2} - 1$. Repeating this process we get $\leq h^1(u-1, w'_1, \cdots, w'_n)$ such that $w'_1 \geq \cdots \geq w'_n$ and $w'_1 + \cdots + w'_n = w - a \geq w - n$. This

$h^1 = 0$ by the induction hypothesis, thus 2) is proved.

3) follows from 2). Indeed, $\sum w_j(w_j+1) = \sum(w_j+\frac{1}{2})^2 - \frac{n}{4} \le \frac{1}{n}(\sum(w_j+\frac{1}{2}))^2 - \frac{n}{4} = \frac{1}{n}(w+\frac{n}{2})^2 - \frac{n}{4} = \frac{1}{n}w^2 + w$ by Schwarz inequality.

Note that both 2) and 3) are valid under the weaker assumption $u \ge w_1 + \cdots + w_a$ instead of $u \ge w$.

We use the induction on u to prove 4). The assertion is trivial for $u = 0$, so suppose $u > 0$. If $w_j < w_{j+1}$ for some j, we have $h^0(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n) = h^0(u, \cdots, w_j + 1, w_j - 1, \cdots)$ since $H^0(\tilde{Y}_j, L(u, w_1, \cdots, w_n)) = 0$. Therefore, as in the proof of 2), we reduce the problem to the case $w_1 \ge \cdots \ge w_n$. Now if $u \ge w_1 + \cdots + w_a$, then 3) applies. Since $\frac{1}{2}(u+1)(u+2) - \frac{1}{2n}w(w+n) - q(nu-w) = \frac{1}{2(n-1)}(n-3-u+w)(u-w) \le 0$, we are done in this case. If $u < w_1 + \cdots + w_a$, we have $L(u, \cdots)\tilde{Z} < 0$. Therefore $h^0(u, \cdots) = h^0(L(u, \cdots) - \tilde{Z}) = h^0(u-1, w_1 - 1, \cdots, w_a - 1, w_{a+1}, \cdots) \le q(nu - w - n + a)$ by the induction hypothesis. Since $q(\theta - n + a) - q(\theta) = -\frac{n-a}{2n(n-1)}(2\theta + n + a) < 0$, we have $h^0(u, \cdots) \le q(nu - w)$ in this case too, as desired.

(3.10) **Lemma.** *$\pi_1^* B - \frac{9}{2}E$ is big in any of the following cases:*
1) $\Xi_{(1)} > \sqrt{321}/9 = 1.990719\cdots$
2) $\Xi_{(2)} > \sqrt{642}/9 = 2.81530\cdots$
3) $\Xi_{(3)} \ge 3.51$.
4) $\Xi_{(4)} \ge 4.23$.
5) $\Xi_{(5)} \ge 5$.

For the proof, we use the following computational result, which is more general than is needed here, and is used later repeatedly.

(3.11) **Lemma.** *For constants α, β and γ, put*

$$f_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(\lambda) = \frac{(3\lambda-\gamma)^3}{\lambda(\lambda-\alpha)(\lambda-\beta)} - \frac{(9\beta-2\gamma-3\lambda)^3}{8\beta(\beta-\alpha)(\lambda-\beta)} \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \epsilon = \alpha+\beta-\gamma.$$

Then

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda}f_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(\lambda) = \frac{3\lambda-\gamma}{4\beta(\beta-\alpha)\lambda^2(\lambda-\alpha)^2}\varphi(\lambda)$$

where $\varphi(\lambda) = 9\lambda^4 - (18\alpha+36\beta-12\gamma)\lambda^3 + (9\alpha(\alpha+8\beta) - 12(2\alpha+\beta)\gamma + 4\gamma^2)\lambda^2 + 4(\alpha-\beta)\gamma(3\alpha-2\gamma)\lambda + 4\alpha(\alpha-\beta)\epsilon^2 = 9\lambda^4 - 6(\alpha+4\beta+2\epsilon)\lambda^3 + ((-11\alpha^2+44\alpha\beta-8\beta^2) + (16\alpha+4\beta)\epsilon + 4\epsilon^2)\lambda^2$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(\tfrac{\gamma}{3}) &= \gamma^2(\gamma-3\alpha)^2,\\
\varphi(3\alpha-\tfrac{2}{3}\gamma) &= 36\alpha(\alpha-\beta)(2\alpha-\beta+\epsilon)^2,\\
\varphi(3\beta-\tfrac{2}{3}\gamma) &= 9\beta(\alpha-\beta)((4\alpha^2-7\alpha\beta+7\beta^2)-8(\alpha-2\beta)\epsilon+4\epsilon^2),\\
\varphi'(\tfrac{\gamma}{3}) &= 2\gamma(\gamma-3\alpha)(4\gamma-3\alpha-6\beta),\\
\varphi'(3\alpha-\tfrac{2}{3}\gamma) &= 12(\alpha-\beta)(13\alpha-2\beta+2\epsilon)(2\alpha-\beta+\epsilon),\\
\varphi'(3\beta-\tfrac{2}{3}\gamma) &= 18(\alpha-\beta)\beta(\alpha-2\beta+2\epsilon),\\
\varphi''(\tfrac{\gamma}{3}) &= 44\gamma^2-12(7\alpha+8\beta)\gamma+18\alpha(\alpha+8\beta)\\
&= (-22\alpha^2+52\alpha\beta-52\beta^2)+(-4\alpha+8\beta)\epsilon+44\epsilon^2,\\
\varphi''(3\alpha-\tfrac{2}{3}\gamma) &= 482\alpha^2-560\alpha\beta+128\beta^2+(176\alpha-136\beta)\epsilon+8\epsilon^2,\\
\varphi''(3\beta-\tfrac{2}{3}\gamma) &= 50\alpha^2-236\alpha\beta+236\beta^2-40(\alpha-2\beta)\epsilon+8\epsilon^2,\\
\varphi'''(\tfrac{\gamma}{3}) &= 36(-3\alpha-6\beta+4\gamma),\\
\varphi'''(3\alpha-\tfrac{2}{3}\gamma) &= 36(13\alpha-8\beta+2\epsilon),\\
\varphi'''(3\beta-\tfrac{2}{3}\gamma) &= 36(-5\alpha+10\beta+2\epsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By elementary computation.

(3.12) Proof of (3.10). The cases 1) and 2) are treated by the same method as in (3.1) and (3.2). For example, in case 2), let $\eta_\lambda(x)=\mathrm{Max}(0,\lambda(x-3)+\gamma)$ with $\gamma>\sqrt{642}/9$. In place of (3.2.4.1), we should show

$$\int_0^{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}} 3x^2dx+\int_{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}}^{\frac{9}{2}}(3x^2-\frac{3}{2}\eta_\lambda(x)^2)dx=\frac{729}{8}-\frac{1}{16\lambda}(3\lambda+2\gamma)^3<51$$

for $\frac{\gamma}{3}\le\lambda\le 3-\frac{2}{3}\gamma$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}} 3x^2dx+\int_{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}}^{\frac{3\lambda-\gamma}{\lambda-1}}(3x^2-\frac{3}{2}\eta_\lambda(x)^2)dx+\int_{\frac{3\lambda-\gamma}{\lambda-1}}^{\frac{9}{2}}\frac{3}{2}(2x-\eta_\lambda(x))^2dx&\\
=\frac{(3\lambda-\gamma)^3}{\lambda(\lambda-1)(\lambda-2)}-\frac{(18-3\lambda-2\gamma)^3}{16(\lambda-2)}&<51
\end{aligned}$$

for $3-\frac{2}{3}\gamma\le\lambda\le 6-\frac{2}{3}\gamma$. It is easy to see that $(3\lambda+2\gamma)^3/\lambda$ is an increasing function for $\lambda>\frac{\gamma}{3}$, so the assertion is valid for $\lambda\le 3-\frac{2}{3}\gamma$. In case $\lambda\ge 3-\frac{2}{3}\gamma$, we apply (3.11) for $\alpha=1$, $\beta=2$ and $\epsilon=3-\gamma=0.1847\cdots$. We have $\varphi'''(3-\frac{2}{3}\gamma)=36(-3+2\epsilon)<0$ and $\varphi'''(6-\frac{2}{3}\gamma)=36(15+2\epsilon)>0$, so φ'' decreases first and then increases in the interval $I=\{3-\frac{2}{3}\gamma\le\lambda\le 6-\frac{2}{3}\gamma\}$. Since $\varphi''(3-\frac{2}{3}\gamma)=-126-96\epsilon+8\epsilon^2<0$ and $\varphi''(6-\frac{2}{3}\gamma)=522+120\epsilon+8\epsilon^2>0$, the sign of φ'' changes only once in I from $-$ to $+$. We have $\varphi'(3-\frac{2}{3}\gamma)=-12(9+2\epsilon)\epsilon<0$ and $\varphi'(6-\frac{2}{3}\gamma)=36(3-2\epsilon)>0$, so the sign of φ' changes once from $-$ to $+$. We have $\varphi(3-\frac{2}{3}\gamma)=-36\epsilon^2<0$ and $\varphi(6-\frac{2}{3}\gamma)=-18(18+24\epsilon+4\epsilon^2)<0$, so $\varphi(\lambda)<0$ for any $\lambda\in I$, hence $f_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(\lambda)$ is decreasing. This yields the desired assertion.

In place of (3.2.4.2), we should show

$$\int_0^{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}} 3x^2dx+\int_{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}}^{\frac{3\lambda-\gamma}{\lambda-1}}(3x^2-\frac{3}{2}\eta_\lambda(x)^2)dx+\int_{\frac{3\lambda-\gamma}{\lambda-2}}^{\frac{9}{2}}\frac{3}{2}(2x-\eta_\lambda(x))^2dx=\frac{(3\lambda-\gamma)^3}{\lambda(\lambda-1)(\lambda-2)}-\frac{(18-3\lambda-2\gamma)^3}{16(\lambda-2)}<51$$

for $\lambda \geq 6 - \frac{2}{3}\gamma$. This is easy since $(3\lambda-\gamma)\lambda(\lambda-1)(\lambda-2)\frac{d}{d\lambda}\log(\frac{(3\lambda-\gamma)^3}{\lambda(\lambda-1)(\lambda-2)}) = ((3\gamma-9)\lambda^2+(12-6\gamma)\lambda+2\gamma) = -\epsilon\lambda^2+(-6+6\epsilon)\lambda+2(3-\epsilon) = 6(1-\lambda)-\epsilon(\lambda^2-6\lambda+2) < 0$.

The other cases 3), 4) and 5) can be treated similarly. In case 5), we have $\xi_{(5)}(x) \geq \eta_\lambda(x) = \mathrm{Max}(0, \lambda(x-3)+5)$ for some $\lambda \geq \frac{5}{3}$. By applying (3.9) as in (3.2.3), we get
$\mathrm{rank}(\rho_{s,j}) \leq \frac{1}{2}(1+j)(2+j) - \frac{1}{10}s\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s})(s\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s})+5)$ if $\frac{j}{s} \geq \xi_{(5)}(\frac{j}{s})$,
$\mathrm{rank}(\rho_{s,j}) \leq \frac{1}{40}(5j - s\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s}))^2 + \frac{1}{4}(5j - s\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s})) + 1$ if $\frac{j}{s} \leq \eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s}) \leq \frac{5j}{s}$ and
$\mathrm{rank}(\rho_{s,j}) = 0$ if $\eta_\lambda(\frac{j}{s}) > \frac{5j}{s}$.
Hence we should estimate

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} d_3(s,m,\lambda) = \int_{\eta_\lambda(x)\leq x}(\frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{10}\eta_\lambda(x)^2)dx + \int_{x\leq\eta_\lambda(x)\leq 5x}\frac{1}{40}(5x-\eta_\lambda(x))^2dx.$$

As before, for $\gamma = 5$, we show

$$\int_0^{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}} 3x^2dx + \int_{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}}^{\frac{3\lambda-\gamma}{\lambda-1}}(3x^2 - \frac{3}{5}\eta_\lambda(x)^2)dx + \int_{\frac{3\lambda-\gamma}{\lambda-1}}^{\frac{9}{2}}\frac{6}{40}(5x-\eta_\lambda(x))^2dx$$
$$= \frac{(3\lambda-\gamma)^3}{\lambda(\lambda-1)(\lambda-5)} - \frac{(45-2\gamma-3\lambda)^3}{160(\lambda-5)} < 51$$

for $\frac{\gamma}{3} \leq \lambda \leq 15 - \frac{2}{3}\gamma$ and

$$\int_0^{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}} 3x^2dx + \cdots + \int_{\frac{3\lambda-\gamma}{\lambda-1}}^{\frac{3\lambda-\gamma}{\lambda-5}}\frac{6}{40}(5x-\eta_\lambda(x))^2dx = (3\lambda-\gamma)^3/\lambda(\lambda-1)(\lambda-5) < 51$$

for $\lambda \geq 15 - \frac{2}{3}\gamma$. This latter case is easy. In the former case we apply (3.11) for $\alpha = 1$, $\beta = 5$, $\gamma = 5$ and $\epsilon = 1$. In the interval $I = \{\frac{\gamma}{3} \leq \lambda \leq 15 - \frac{2}{3}\gamma\} = [\frac{5}{3}, \frac{35}{3}]$, φ''' increases from $-$ to $+$. Since $\varphi''(\frac{5}{3}) < 0$ and $\varphi''(\frac{35}{3}) > 0$, the sign of φ'' changes once from $-$ to $+$. We have $\varphi'(\frac{5}{3}) = -260 < 0$ and $\varphi'(\frac{35}{3}) = 2520 > 0$, so φ' changes its sign from $-$ to $+$. Since $\varphi(\frac{5}{3}) = 100 > 0$ and $\varphi(\frac{35}{3}) = -39600 < 0$, the sign of φ changes from $+$ to $-$ at some $\lambda_1 \in I$, and $f_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(\lambda)$ attains the maximum at $\lambda = \lambda_1$. By computation we see $\varphi(1.922) > 0$ and $\varphi(1.923) < 0$, hence $1.922 < \lambda_1 < 1.923$, so $f(\lambda_1) < \frac{1}{5-1.923}\left(\frac{(35-3\times1.922)^3}{160} - \frac{(3\times1.922-5)^3}{1.923\times0.923}\right) = 50.66\cdots < 51$, as desired.

In case 4), we have $\xi_{(4)}(x) \geq \eta_\lambda(x) = \mathrm{Max}(0, \lambda(x-3)+\gamma)$ for $\gamma = 4.23$ for some $\lambda \geq \frac{\gamma}{3}$. Similarly as before, we have

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} d_3(s.m.\lambda) = \int_{\eta_\lambda(x)\leq x}(\frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{1}{8}\eta_\lambda(x)^2)dx + \int_{x\leq\eta_\lambda(x)\leq 4x}\frac{1}{24}(4x-\eta_\lambda(x))^2dx.$$

We show $\frac{(3\lambda-\gamma)^3}{\lambda(\lambda-1)(\lambda-4)} - \frac{(36-2\gamma-3\lambda)^3}{96(\lambda-4)} < 51$ for $\frac{\gamma}{3} < \lambda \leq 12 - \frac{2}{3}\gamma$ and $\frac{(3\lambda-\gamma)^3}{\lambda(\lambda-1)(\lambda-4)} < 51$ for $\lambda \geq 12 - \frac{2}{3}\gamma$. The latter is easy. In the former case we apply (3.11) for $\alpha = 1$, $\beta = 4$, $\gamma = 4.23$ and $\epsilon = 0.77$. Then $\varphi(\lambda) = 9\lambda^4 - 111.24\lambda^3 + 64.0116\lambda^2 + 277.1496\lambda - 214.7148$ and $\varphi(1.581) > 0 > \varphi(1.582)$, so $f(\lambda)$ attains the maximum at $\lambda = \lambda_1$ with $1.581 < \lambda_1 < 1.582$. Hence $f(\lambda_1) < \frac{1}{4-1.582}\left(\frac{(27.54-3\times1.581)^3}{96} - \frac{(3\times1.581-4.23)^3}{1.582\times0.582}\right) = 50.97\cdots < 51$, as desired.

In case 3), for $\gamma = 3.51$ we show $\frac{(3\lambda-\gamma)^3}{\lambda(\lambda-1)(\lambda-3)} - \frac{(27-2\gamma-3\lambda)^3}{48(\lambda-3)} < 51$ for $\frac{\gamma}{3} < \lambda \leq 9 - \frac{2}{3}\gamma$
$\frac{(3\lambda-\gamma)^3}{\lambda(\lambda-1)(\lambda-3)} < 51$

for $\alpha = 1$, $\beta = 3$, $\gamma = 3.51$. We have $\varphi(\lambda) = 9\lambda^4 - 83.88\lambda^3 + 63.6804\lambda^2 + 112.8816\lambda - 98.5608$ and $\varphi(1.253) > 0 > \varphi(1.254)$, so $f(\lambda) < \dfrac{1}{3-1.254}\left(\dfrac{(19.98-3\times 1.253)^3}{48} - \dfrac{(3\times 1.253-3.51)^3}{1.254\times 0.254}\right) = 50.899\cdots < 51$.

(3.13) Now we divide the cases according to the nature of the place P.
1) A representative pair of P is obtained by a process as (3.3;1) and $P = \mathcal{P}(E_{(i)}, Y_{(i)})$.
2) The representing process goes via (3.3;2), so the locus of P on $E_{(i.j)}$ is contained in $Y_{(i.j)}$.

In the former case 1), we have $c_{(i)} \leq 1$ and $m_{(1)} + \cdots + m_{(i)} = \mu_{(i)} \geq r_{(i)} + 1 = i + 1$ (cf. (3.6)). By (3.10), we can get rid of such a situation when $i \leq 5$, similarly as in (3.1) and (3.2). When $i > 5$, we have $\mu_{(5)} = m_{(1)} + \cdots + m_{(5)} \geq \frac{5}{i}\mu_{(i)} > 5$ since $m_{(1)} \geq \cdots \geq m_{(i)}$, hence (3.10;5) takes care of this case.

Thus, from now on, we consider the above case 2).

(3.14) Suppose that $i > 5$. By (3.7) we have $1 \leq \Delta_{(i.1)} = \delta_{(i.1)} + m_{(i-1)} = \mu_{(i.1)} - r_{(i.1)} + m_{(i-1)} = m_{(1)} + \cdots + m_{(i-1)} + m_{(i.1)} - i + m_{(i-1)}$. Hence $\mu_{(5)} = m_{(1)} + \cdots + m_{(5)} \geq \frac{5}{i+1}(m_{(1)} + \cdots + m_{(i-1)} + m_{(i.1)} + m_{(i-1)}) \geq 5$, so this case is treated by (3.10;5). Note that, if we choose a Hironaka model for which $mu_{(5)} < 5$, then the above situation cannot occur at *every* place whose locus is contained in $Y_{(5)}$.

From now on, we assume $i \leq 5$.

(3.15) There are now the following three cases:
1) $P = \mathcal{P}(Y_{(i.j)})$.
2) The locus of P is the point $Y_{(i.j)} \cap Y_{(i.j-1)}$. The process continues via a step (3.3;3).
3) The locus of P is a point of $Y_{(i.j)}$ off the othe (-1)-curves. The process continues via a step as (3.3;5).

We have $\delta_{(i.j)} \geq 1$ in case 1), $\delta_{(i.j)} + m_{(i.j-1)} \geq 1$ in case 2) by (3.7), and $\delta_{(i.j)} + m_{(i.j)} \geq 1$ in case 3). In any case $\delta_{(i.j)} + m_{(i.j-1)} \geq 1$.

(3.16) First suppose that $i = 5$. We have $1 \leq \delta_{(5.j)} + m_{(5.j-1)} = j\delta_{(4)} + m_{(5.1)} + \cdots + m_{(5.j)} - j + m_{(5.j-1)}$. On the other hand $\mu_{(4)} = m_{(1)} + \cdots + m_{(4)} \geq 4m_{(4)} \geq 4(m_{(5.1)} + \cdots + m_{(5.j)}) \geq 4(j-1)m_{(5.j-1)}$, so $1 \leq j(\mu_{(4)} - 4) + \frac{1}{4}\mu_{(4)} - j + \frac{1}{4(j-1)}\mu_{(4)}$, hence $\mu_{(4)} \geq (5j+1)/(j + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4(j-1)}) = 4(5j+1)(j-1)/j(4j-3)$. This is an increasing function in j, so $\mu_{(4)} \geq \frac{22}{5} = 4.4$ for $j \geq 2$. By (3.10;4) we are done in this case.

Next suppose that $i = 4$. As above, we have $1 \leq \delta_{(4.j)} + m_{(4.j-1)} = j\delta_{(3)} + m_{(4.1)} + \cdots + m_{(4.j)} - j + m_{(4.j-1)}$ and $\mu_{(3)} \geq 3m_{(3)} \geq 3(m_{(4.1)} + \cdots + m_{(4.j)}) \geq 3(j-1)m_{(4.j-1)}$. Hence $\mu_{(3)} \geq (4j+1)/(j + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3(j-1)}) = 3(4j+1)(j-1)/j(3j-2) \geq \frac{26}{7} = 3.7\cdots$ for $j \geq 3$, and we are done in this case by (3.10;3). But the case $j = 2$ still survives.

Suppose now that $i = 3$. In this case we have $\mu_{(2)} \geq (3j+1)/(j + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2(j-1)}) = 2(3j+1)(j-1)/j(2j-1)$ as above. Hence $\mu_{(2)} \geq \frac{128}{45} = 2.84\cdots$ when $j \geq 5$, and we can use (3.10;2). But the cases $j \leq 4$ are left to be studied.

When $i = 2$, the same argument works if $j > 108$. Thus, we may assume $i \leq 4$, and further $j = 2$ (resp. $j \leq 4$, $j \leq 108$) when $i = 4$ (resp. $i = 3$, $i = 2$).

(3.17) Suppose that $i = 4$ and $j = 2$. We divide this case as in (3.15).

In case 1), we have $1 \leq \delta_{(4.2)} = 2\delta_{(3)} + m_{(4.1)} + m_{(4.2)} - 2$, so $\mu_{(3)} \geq 9/(2 + \frac{1}{3}) = 3.85\cdots$ and we are done by (3.10;3).

In case 3), we have $1 \leq \delta_{(4.2)} + m_{(4.2)}$ by (3.7), and $\mu_{(3)} \geq 3m_{(3)} \geq 3(m_{(4.1)} + m_{(4.2)}) \geq 6m_{(4.2)}$. Hence $\mu_{(3)} \geq 9/(2 + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{6}) = 3.6$ and we are done.

In case 2), we have $1 \leq \Delta_{(4.2.k)} = \delta_{(4.2.k)} + m_{(4.2.k-1)}$. By the method (3.6), we get $\delta_{(4.2.k)} = \delta_{(4.2.1)} + (k-1)\delta_{(4.1)} + m_{(4.2.2)} + \cdots + m_{(4.2.k)} - (k-1) = \delta_{(3)} + k\delta_{(4.1)} + m_{(4.2.1)} +$

$4(m_{(4.2.1)}+\cdots+m_{(4.2.k)}) \geq 4(k-1)m_{(4.2.k-1)}$. Therefore $\mu_{(4.1)} \geq (5k+4)/(k+1+\frac{1}{4(k-1)}) = 4(5k+4)(k-1)/(4k^2-3) \geq \frac{56}{13} = 4.3\cdots$ since $k \geq 2$. Hence we can use (3.10;4).

Thus we are done in this case $(i,j) = (4,2)$.

(3.18) It turns out that (3.10) is not enough to study the remaining cases with $i \leq 3$. We need a few results on $E_{(i.j)}$ of the type (3.10). The counterpart of (3.9) in this situation is the following

Lemma. *Let $E_{(i.j)}$ be the surface obtained by the process (3.3;2), H be the pull-back of $\mathcal{O}_E(1)$, Y_n and $Y_{i.n}$ be the total transforms of the (-1)-curves $Y_{(n)}$ and $Y_{(i.n)}$ respectively, while their proper transformations are denoted by $\tilde{Y}_n$ and $\tilde{Y}_{i.n}$. Put $L(u,w_1,\cdots,w_{i-1},w_{i.1},\cdots,w_{i.j}) = uH - w_1Y_1 - \cdots - w_{i-1}Y_{i-1} - w_{i.1}Y_{i.1} - \cdots - w_{i.j}Y_{i.j} \in \mathrm{Pic}(E_{(i.j)})$, $h^p(u,w_1,\cdots) = \dim H^p(E_{(i.j)}, L(u,w_1,\cdots))$, $w = j(w_1+\cdots+w_{i-1})+w_{i.1}+\cdots+w_{i.j}$ and $\beta = (i-1)j+1$. Then*
1) $h^0(u,w_1,\cdots) = 0$ if $w > \beta u$.
2) $h^1(u,w_1,\cdots) = 0$ and $h^0(u,w_1,\cdots) = \frac{1}{2}(u+1)(u+2) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_* w_*(w_*+1)$ if $u \geq w_1+\cdots+w_{i-1}+w_{i.1}$, $w_1 \geq \cdots \geq w_{i-1} \geq w_{1.1}+\cdots+w_{i.j}$ and $w_{i.1} \geq \cdots \geq w_{i.j}$.
3) $h^0(u,w_1,\cdots) \leq \frac{1}{2}(1+u)(2+u) - \frac{1}{2j\beta}(w+\frac{ij}{2})^2 + \frac{1}{8}(i+j-1)$ if $w \leq jw$.
4) $h^0(u,w_1,\cdots) \leq q(\beta u - w)$ if $w \leq \beta u$, where
$$q(\theta) =_{\mathrm{def}} \frac{1}{2\beta(\beta-j)}\theta^2 + \frac{2\beta-j+1}{2\beta(\beta-j)}\theta + 1 + \frac{(i-1)(j-1)^2}{8\beta}.$$

Proof. We argue as in (3.9) by induction on u. The assertions are obvious when $u = 0$, so we may suppose $u > 0$. Let $\tilde{Z} \in |H - Y_1 - \cdots - Y_a|$ be the proper transform of a line as in (3.9), where $2 \leq a \leq i$. The problem is reduced to the case $w_1 \geq \cdots \geq w_{i-1}$ and $w_{i.1} \geq \cdots \geq w_{i.j}$. Moreover we may assume $w_{i-1} \geq w_{i.1}+\cdots+w_{i.j}$, since otherwise we have $L(u,w_1,\cdots)\tilde{Y}_{i-1} < 0$ and $h^0(u,w_1,\cdots) \leq h^0(u,w_1,\cdots,w_{i-1}+1,w_{i.1}+1,\cdots,w_{i.j}-1)$.

As for 1), we have $L\tilde{Z} = u - w_1 - \cdots - w_a \leq u - \frac{w}{ij}a \leq \frac{u}{ij}(ij - a\beta) < 0$, so we are done as in (3.9).

2) is valid under the weaker assumption $u \geq w_1+\cdots+w_a$ instead of $u \geq w_1+\cdots+w_{i-1}+w_{i.1}$. We can prove this stronger assertion by induction on u. But the cases $a = i$ and $a < i$ need slightly different arguments, so suppose first $a < i$. Any way we have $h^1(\tilde{Z}, L(u,\cdots)) = 0$, hence $h^1(u,\cdots) \leq h^1(L(u,\cdots) - \tilde{Z}) = h^1(u-1, w_1-1, \cdots, w_a-1, w_{a+1}, \cdots)$. This last term vanishes if $w_a > w_{a+1}$ by the induction hypothesis. If not, we have $w_a = w_{a+1}$ and $h^1(\tilde{Y}_a, L(u,\cdots) - \tilde{Z}) = 0$, so the above term $\leq h^1(u-1,\cdots,w_a,w_{a+1}-1,\cdots)$ as in (3.9). Proceeding similarly we further get $\leq h^1(u-1,w'_1,\cdots,w'_{a+1},\cdots)$ such that $w'_1 \geq \cdots \geq w'_{a+1} = w_{a+1}-1$. If $w_{a+1} > w_{a+2}$ we are done. Otherwise by similar process we get $\leq h^1(u-1, w''_1,\cdots,w''_{a+2},\cdots)$ such that $w''_1 \geq \cdots \geq w''_{a+2} = w_{a+2}-1$. After several steps we eventually get $\leq h^1(u-1,\cdots,w_{i-1}-1,w_{i.1},\cdots)$. If $w_{i-1} > w_{i.1}+\cdots+w_{i.j}$ then we are done. If not, we have $w_{i-1} = w_{i.1}+\cdots+w_{i.j}$ and $h^1(\tilde{Y}_{i-1}, L(u-1,\cdots,w_{i-1}-1,w_{i.1},\cdots)) = 0$, so the above term $\leq h^1(L(\cdots,w_{i-1}-1,w_{i.1},\cdots) - \tilde{Y}_{i-1}) = h^1(u-1,\cdots,w_{i-1},w_{i.1}-1,\cdots,w_{i.j}-1)$. This vanishes by the induction hypothesis.

Now we consider the case $a = i$. In this case we have $h^1(u,\cdots) \leq h^1(u-1,w_1-1,\cdots,w_{i-1}-1,w_{i.1}-1,w_{i.2},\cdots)$. This vanishes by the induction hypothesis if $w_{i.1} > w_{i.2}$. If $w_{i.1} = w_{1.2}$, we have $h^1(\tilde{Y}_{i.1}, L(u-1,\cdots,w_{i.1}-1,w_{i.2},\cdots)) = 0$, so the above $h^1 \leq h^1(L(\cdots,w_{i.1}-1,w_{i.2},\cdots) - \tilde{Y}_{i.1}) = h^1(\cdots,w_{i.1},w_{1.2}-1,\cdots)$. This vanishes unless $w_{i.2} = w_{i.3}$. Continueing similarly, we eventually get $\leq h^1(\cdots,w_{i.j-1},w_{i.j}-1)$, which vanishes by the induction hypothesis.

Thus $h^1 = 0$ is proved in either case. The assertion for h^0 follows from the Riemann-Roch theorem.

$+(w_{i.1}+\frac{1}{2})^2+\cdots+(w_{i.j}+\frac{1}{2})^2)(j^2+\cdots+j^2+1^2+\cdots+1^2)$.

4) is proved as in (3.9). First consider the case $i=2$. If $w \le ju$ 3) implies 4) since $q(\beta u-w)-$(the right side of 3) $=\frac{1}{2j(\beta-j)}(w-ju)(w-ju+(i-3)j) \ge 0$. If $w>ju$ we have $u<w_1+w_{2.1}$, so $h^0(\tilde{Z},L(u,\cdots))=0$ and $h^0(u,\cdots)=h^0(u-1,w_1-1,w_{2.1}-1\cdots) \le q(\beta(u-1)-j(w_1-1)-(w_{2.1}-1)-\cdots)=q(\beta u-w)$ by the induction hypothesis. Thus we are done in either case.

Second consider the case $i=3$. We have $q(\beta u-w) \ge$ (the right side of 3) again, so the assertion is true if $u \ge w_1+\cdots+w_a$. If $u<w_1+\cdots+w_a$, we have $h^0(u,\cdots)=h^0(u-1,w_1-1,\cdots,w_a-1,w_{a+1},\cdots) \le q(\beta(u-1)-j(w_1-1)-\cdots)$ by the induction hypothesis. When $a<i=3$, we have $a=2$ and $\beta(u-1)-j(w_1-1)-\cdots=\beta u-w-\beta+aj=\beta u-w-1$, so we are done since $q(\beta u-w-1)-q(\beta u-w)=(-2(\beta u-w)-2\beta+j)/2\beta(\beta-j)<0$. When $a=i=3$, $\beta(u-1)-j(w_1-1)-j(w_2-1)-(w_{3.1}-1)-w_{3.2}-\cdots=\beta u-w$ and we are done.

Remark. 1),2) and 3) are true even if $i>3$, but 4) is uncertain.

(3.19) **Lemma.** *$\pi_1^*B-\frac{9}{2}E$ is big in any of the following cases:*
1) $\Xi_{(3.2)} \ge 6.31$.
2) $\Xi_{(3.3)} \ge 9.13$.
3) $\Xi_{(3.4)} \ge 12$.

Proof. Similar as (3.10). For $\gamma=6.31$ (resp. 9.13, 12) in case $j=2$ (resp. $j=3$, $j=4$), we show

$$\int_{\eta_\lambda(x)\le jx}(\frac{1}{2}x^2-\frac{\eta_\lambda(x)^2}{2j\beta})dx+\int_{jx\le\eta_\lambda(x)\le\beta x}\frac{\beta x-\eta_\lambda(x))^2}{2\beta(\beta-j)}dx<\frac{51}{6},$$

where $\beta=2j+1$ is as in (3.18) and $\eta_\lambda(x)=\mathrm{Max}(0,\lambda(x-3)+\gamma)$. The problem is reduced to $f_{j,\beta,\gamma}(\lambda)<51$ if $\frac{\gamma}{3}<\lambda\le 3\beta-\frac{2}{3}\gamma$, and $(3\lambda-\gamma)/\lambda(\lambda-j)(\lambda-\beta)<51$ if $\lambda \ge 3\beta-\frac{2}{3}\gamma$. The latter inequality is easy to prove. To show the former, we argue as in (3.12) using (3.11). $\varphi(t)$ changes its sign from + to − once at some λ_1, and $f_{j,\beta,\gamma}(t)$ attains the maximum at λ_1. By computation we see $2.161<\lambda_1<2.162$ (resp. $3.069<\lambda_1<3.07$) in case $j=2$ (resp. $j=3$), and get the desired inequality as before. The case $j=4$, $\gamma=12$ is even easier. Indeed $\varphi<0$ and the maximum is attained at $\lambda_1=4$.

(3.20) **Lemma.** *Suppose that $\delta_0<1$ and $m_0<1$ in the situation (3.3;5). Then*
1) $\delta_0+m_0 \ge \frac{3}{2}$.
2) $\delta_0+\dfrac{q^2+q+1}{(q+1)^2}m_0 \ge 2-\dfrac{1}{q+1}$ *for some* $q \ge 2$.
3) $m_0 \ge \frac{6}{7}$.

Proof. The blow-up process continues via a step

$$\vdash -[2]-\cdots-[i'-1]-[i'.p]-\cdots-[i'.1]$$

unless $P=\mathcal{P}(Y_{[i']})$, where we set $p=j'$. Since $1>m_0 \ge m_{[2]} \ge \cdots \ge m_{[i']}$ (cf. (3.5), (3.6)), we have $\delta_0>\delta_0+m_{[2]}-1=\delta_{[2]}>\cdots>\delta_{[i']}$, so the latter exceptional case is ruled out. Moreover, replacing δ_0 and m_0 by $\delta_{[i'-1]}$ and $m_{[i'-1]}$ if necessary, we can suppose $i'=2$. Then we have $1 \le \delta_{[2.p]}+m_{[2.p-1]}=p(\delta_0-1)+m_{[2.1]}+\cdots+m_{[2.p]}+m_{[2.p-1]}$ by (3.7). Since $1>m_0 \ge m_{[2.1]}+\cdots+m_{[2.p]} \ge (p-1)m_{[2.p-1]}$, we infer $1 \le p(\delta_0-1)+(1+\frac{1}{p-1})m_0 \le 2(\delta_0-1)+2m_0$, which yields 1).

If $\delta_{[2.p]} \ge 1$, we have $1 \le p(\delta_0-1)+m_{[2.1]}+\cdots+m_{[2.p]} \le p(\delta_0-1)+m_0$, contradicting the assumption.

If $\delta_{[2.p]}+m_{[2.p]} \ge \frac{3}{2}$ (cf. 1), then $\frac{3}{2} \le p(\delta_0-1)+m_0+\frac{1}{2p}m_0<1+\frac{1}{2p}$, absurd.

Thus the process continues via the step (3.3;6), where we set $k'=q$. Then $1 \le \delta_{[2.p.q]}+m_{[2.p.q-1]} \le \delta_0+q(\delta_{[2.p.q-1]}-1)+m_{[2.p.q-1]}+\cdots+m_{[2.p.q]}+m_{[2.p.q-1]}$ and

$1 \le ((p-1)q+1)\delta_0 - pq + q(m_{[2.1]} + \cdots + m_{[2.p-1]}) + m_{[2.p.1]} + \cdots + m_{[2.p.q]} + m_{[2.p.q-1]}$. On the other hand $m_0 \ge m_{[2.1]} + \cdots + m_{[2.p-1]} + m_{[2.p.1]} \ge (p-1)m_{[2.p-1]} + m_{[2.p.1]} \ge ((p-1)q+1)m_{[2.p.q]}$ and $qm_{[2.p.1]} \ge m_{[2.p.1]} + \cdots + m_{[2.p.q-2]} + 2m_{[2.p.q-1]}$, so we get
$1 + pq \le ((p-1)q+1)\delta_0 + (q + \frac{1}{(p-1)q+1})m_0 \le (q+1)\delta_0 + (p-2)q + (q + \frac{1}{q+1})m_0$. Hence $1 + 2q \le (q+1)\delta_0 + (q + \frac{1}{q+1})m_0$, which yields 2).

2) yields $dfrac(q^2+q+1)(q+1)^2 m_0 \ge 1 - \dfrac{1}{q+1} = dfracqq+1$, so $m \ge \dfrac{q(q+1)}{q^2+q+1} = 1 - \dfrac{1}{q^2+q+1} \ge \dfrac{6}{7}$, proving 3).

(3.21) Let us consider the case $i = 3$, $j \le 4$.

If $P = \mathcal{P}(Y_{(3.j)})$, we have $1 \le \delta_{(3.j)}$ and $\mu_{(3.j)} \ge r_{(3.j)} + 1 = 3j + 1$, so (3.19) applies.

In case (3.3;5), we have $\delta_{(3.j)} + m_{(3.j)} \ge \frac{3}{2}$ by (3.20;1). Since $\delta_{(3.j)} = \mu_{(3.j)} - 3j$ and $\mu_{(3.j)} = j(m_{(1)} + m_{(2)}) + m_{(3.1)} + \cdots + m_{(3.j)} \ge 2jm_{(2)} + m_{(3.1)} + \cdots + m_{(3.j)} \ge (2j+1)(m_{(3.1)} + \cdots + m_{(3.j)}) \ge (2j+1)jm_{(3.j)}$, we have $\mu_{(3.j)} \ge (3j + \frac{3}{2})/(1 + \frac{1}{j(2j+1)})$. Hence (3.19) applies in any case $j = 2, 3, 4$.

In the remaining cases the process continues via (3.3;3). Then we have $1 \le \delta_{(3.j.k)} + m_{(3.j.k-1)} = \delta_{(2)} + k(\delta_{(3.j-1)} - 1) + m_{(3.j.1)} + \cdots + 2m_{(3.j.k-1)} + m_{(3.j.k)} \le \delta_{(2)} + k(\delta_{(3.j-1)} - 1) + km_{(3.j.1)} + m_{(3.j.k)} = ((j-1)k+1)(m_{(1)} + m_{(2)}) + k(m_{(3.1)} + \cdots + m_{(3.j-1)} + m_{(3.j.1)}) + m_{(3.j.k)} - 2 - 3(j-1)k - k = \frac{(j-1)k+1}{j}\mu_{(3.j)} + \frac{k-1}{j}(m_{(3.1)} + \cdots + m_{(3.j)}) + m_{(3.j.k)} - (3j-2)k - 2$ and $\mu_{(3.j)} \ge (2j+1)(m_{(3.1)} + \cdots + m_{(3.j)}) \ge (2j+1)((j-1)m_{(3.j-1)} + m_{(3.j.1)}) \ge (2j+1)((j-1)k+1)m_{(3.j.k)}$. Hence $\mu_{(3.j)} \ge ((3j-2)k+3)/(\frac{(j-1)k+1}{j} + \frac{k-1}{j}\frac{1}{2j+1} + \frac{1}{(2j+1)((j-1)k+1)})$. When $j = 2$, this yields $\mu_{(3.j)} \ge 5(4k+3)/(3k+2+\frac{1}{k+1}) \ge 6.6$ for every $k \ge 2$. When $j = 3$ we get $\mu_{(3.j)} \ge 7(7k+3)/(5k+2+\frac{1}{2k+1}) > 9.7$ for every $k \ge 2$. When $j = 4$ we get $\mu_{(3.j)} \ge 9(10k+3)/(7k+2+\frac{1}{3k+1}) > 12$ for every $k \ge 2$. Thus (3.19) applies in any case.

(3.22) Now it remains only the cases $i = 2$, $j \le 108$. We will show the bigness of $\pi_1^* B - \frac{9}{2}E$ assuming $\Xi_{(2.j)} \ge \gamma_{(2.j)}$ for some number $\gamma = \gamma_{(2.j)}$ slightly smaller than $r_{(2.j)} + 1 = 2j + 1$.

As before, $\Xi_{(2.j)}(\pi_1^* B - xE) \ge \eta_\lambda(x) =_{\text{def}} \mathrm{Max}(0, \lambda(x-3) + \gamma)$ for some $\lambda \ge \frac{\gamma}{3}$. By (3.18), we should estimate

$$\psi(\lambda) = \int_{\eta_\lambda(x) \le jx} \left(\frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{\eta_\lambda(x)^2}{2j\beta}\right) dx + \int_{jx \le \eta_\lambda(x) \le \beta x} \frac{\beta x - \eta_\lambda(x))^2}{2\beta(\beta - j)} dx \ .$$

Unlike the case $i = 3$, we have $\frac{\gamma}{3} < 3j - \frac{2}{3}\gamma$, so there are the three cases:

1) $\frac{\gamma}{3} < \lambda \le 3j - \frac{2}{3}\gamma$. $6\psi(\lambda) = \displaystyle\int_0^{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}} 3x^2 + \int_{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}}^{\frac{9}{2}} \left(3x^2 - \frac{3(\lambda(x-3)+\gamma)^2}{j\beta}\right) dx$
$= \dfrac{729}{8} - \dfrac{1}{j\beta\lambda}\left(\dfrac{3}{2}\lambda + \gamma\right)^3$.

2) $3j - \frac{2}{3}\gamma \le \lambda \le 3\beta - \frac{2}{3}\gamma$. $6\psi(\lambda) = \displaystyle\int_0^{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}} 3x^2 dx + \int_{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}}^{\frac{3\lambda-\gamma}{\lambda-j}} \left(3x^2 - \frac{3\eta_\lambda(x)^2}{j\beta}\right) dx +$
$\displaystyle\int_{\frac{3\lambda-\gamma}{\lambda-j}}^{\frac{9}{2}} \frac{3(\beta x - \eta_\lambda(x))^2}{(\beta-j)\beta} dx = \frac{(3\lambda-\gamma)^3}{\lambda(\lambda-j)(\lambda-\beta)} - \frac{(9\beta - 2\gamma - 3\lambda)^3}{8\beta(\beta-j)(\lambda-\beta)}$.

3) $3\beta - \frac{2}{3}\gamma \le \lambda$. $6\psi(\lambda) = \dfrac{(3\lambda-\gamma)^3}{\lambda(\lambda-j)(\lambda-\beta)}$.

In the range 3), we have $\frac{d}{d\lambda}\log\psi = \frac{9}{3\lambda-\gamma} - \frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\lambda-j} - \frac{1}{\lambda-\beta} < 0$, since $\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\lambda-j} + \frac{1}{\lambda-\beta} > 3\sqrt[3]{\frac{1}{\lambda}\cdot\frac{1}{\lambda-j}\cdot\frac{1}{\lambda-\beta}}$ and $\sqrt[3]{\lambda(\lambda-j)(\lambda-\beta)} \le \frac{1}{3}(\lambda + (\lambda-j) + (\lambda-\beta)) = \frac{1}{3}(3\lambda - 2j - 1) \le \frac{1}{3}(3\lambda - \gamma)$.

decreases in this range too.

In the range 2), we use (3.11) to analyze $6\psi = f_{j,\beta,\gamma}$. Note that $\beta = j+1$ and $\epsilon = 2j+1-\gamma \geq 0$. Set $c = 3j-\frac{2}{3}\gamma$ and $d = 3\beta-\frac{2}{3}\gamma$. We have $\varphi''' \geq \varphi'''(c) = 36(5j-8+2\epsilon) > 0$, so φ'' increases. Since $\varphi''(d) = 50j^2+236j+236+(40j+80)\epsilon+8\epsilon^2 > 0$, φ'' is either everywhere positive in this range 2) or varies from $-$ to $+$. In either case, since $\varphi'(c) = -12(11j-2+2\epsilon)(j-1+\epsilon) < 0$ and $\varphi'(d) = 18(j+1)(j+2-2\epsilon) > 0$, φ' varies from $-$ to $+$. We have $\varphi(c) = -36j(j-1+\epsilon)^2 < 0$ and $\varphi(d) = -9(j+1)(4j^2+7j+7+8(j+2)\epsilon+4\epsilon^2) < 0$, so $\varphi < 0$ in this range and ψ decreases.

Thus we conclude $\psi(\lambda) \leq \psi(\frac{\gamma}{3}) = \frac{27}{16}(9-\frac{\gamma^2}{j\beta})$, hence

(3.23) *$\pi_1^*B - \frac{9}{2}E$ is big if $\Xi_{(2.j)} > \sqrt{321j(j+1)}/9$.*

Indeed, $\frac{27}{16}(9-\frac{\gamma^2}{j\beta}) < \frac{51}{6}$ iff $\gamma > \sqrt{321j\beta}/9$.

(3.24) By (3.7) we have $1 \leq \delta_{(2.j)} + m_{(2.j-1)} = \mu_{(2.j)} - 2j + m_{(2.j-1)}$, while $\mu_{(2.j)} = jm_{(1)} + m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j)} \geq (j+1)(j-1)m_{(2.j-1)}$. Hence $\mu_{(2.j)} \geq (2j+1)/(1+\frac{1}{(j+1)(j-1)})$. By computation we see (the right side) $\geq \sqrt{321j(j+1)}/9$ for $j \geq 14$. Now the cases $j \leq 13$ are left.

(3.25) We assume $j \leq 13$ from now on. If $\delta_{(2.j)} \geq 1$, then $\mu_{(2.j)} \geq 2j+1$ and we are done by (3.23) for any $j \geq 2$. If the process continues as (3.3;5), we have $\delta_{(2.j)} + (1-\frac{q}{(q+1)^2})m_{(2.j)} \geq 2-\frac{1}{q+1}$ for some $q \geq 2$ by (3.20;2). Moreover $\mu_{(2.j)} \geq (j+1)(m_{(2.1)}+\cdots+m_{(2.j)}) \geq j(j+1)m_{(2.j)}$, so $\left(1+\dfrac{q^2+q+1}{(q+1)^2j(j+1)}\right)\mu_{(2.j)} \geq 2j+2-\frac{1}{q+1}$. We may assume $\mu_{(2.j)} < 2j+1$, hence $\dfrac{q^2+q+1}{(q+1)^2}\cdot\dfrac{2j+1}{j(j+1)} \geq 1-\frac{1}{q+1} = \frac{q}{q+1}$, so $\dfrac{2j+1}{j(j+1)} \geq \dfrac{q(q+1)}{q^2+q+1}$. But the left side $\leq \frac{5}{6}$ for any $j \geq 2$, while the right side $= 1-\frac{1}{q^2+q+1} \geq \frac{6}{7}$ for any $q \geq 2$. Thus we get a contradiction.

Therefore, the blow-up process must continue as (3.3;3).

(3.26) Now we have $1 \leq \delta_{(2.j.k)} + m_{(2.j.k-1)}$. Since $\delta_{(2.j.k)} = \delta_{(1)} + k(\delta_{(2.j-1)}-1) + m_{(2.j.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.k)}$, $\delta_{(2.j-1)} = (j-1)(\delta_{(1)}-1) + m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}$, $\delta_{(1)} = m_{(1)} - 1$ and $\mu_{(2.j)} = jm_{(1)} + m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)} + m_{(2.j.1)} \geq (j+1)(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)} + m_{(2.j.1)}) \geq (j+1)((j-1)k+1)m_{(2.j.k)}$, we infer $(2j-1)k+2 \leq ((j-1)k+1)m_{(1)} + k(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + m_{(2.j.1)} + \cdots + 2m_{(2.j.k-1)} + m_{(2.j.k)} \leq \frac{(j-1)k+1}{j}\mu_{(2.j)} + \frac{k-1}{j}(m_{(2.1)}+\cdots+m_{(2.j-1)}) - \frac{(j-1)(k-1)}{j}m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2)} + \cdots \leq (\frac{(j-1)k+1}{j} + \frac{k-1}{j(j+1)})\mu_{(2.j)} - (k-1)m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2)} + \cdots + 2m_{(2.j.k-1)} + m_{(2.j.k)} \leq \frac{jk+1}{j+1}\mu_{(2.j)} + m_{(2.j.k)} \leq (\frac{jk+1}{j+1} + \frac{1}{(j+1)((j-1)k+1)})\mu_{(2.j)}$, therefore $\mu_{(2.j)} \geq ((2j-1)k+2)/(\frac{jk+1}{j+1} + \frac{1}{(j+1)((j-1)k+1)}) = (j+1)((2j-1)k+2)((j-1)k+1)/((jk+1)((j-1)k+1)+1)$. Hence $\mu_{(2.j)} \geq (j+1)(2j-1)/j$, since $j((2j-1)k+2)((j-1)k+1) - (2j-1)((jk+1)((j-1)k+1)+1) = (j-1)(k-2) \geq 0$.

(3.27) Now we divide the cases by j.

For $j = 13$, we have $\mu_{(2.j)} \geq 14(25k+2)(12k+1)/(156k^2+25k+2) \geq \frac{350}{13} = 26.9\cdots$ for any $k \geq 2$, so we are done by (3.23) since $\sqrt{321j(j+1)}/9 = 26.85\cdots$.

For $j = 12$, we have $\mu_{(2.j)} \geq 13(23k+2)(11k+1)/(132k^2+23k+2) \geq \frac{299}{12} = 24.9\cdots$ for any $k \geq 2$. For $j = 11$, $\mu_{(2.j)} \geq 12(21k+2)(10k+1)/(110k^2+21k+2) \geq \frac{252}{11} = 22.9\cdots$. For $j = 10$, $\mu_{(2.j)} \geq 20.9$ and for $j = 9$ $\mu_{(2.j)} \geq \frac{170}{9} = 18.888\cdots$. In any of these cases we can apply (3.23).

However, when $j \leq 8$, we must still work harder. We need a result of the type (3.23) in terms of $\Xi_{(2.j.k)}$.

(3.28) **Lemma.** *Let $L(u, w_1, w_{2.1}, \cdots, w_{2.j-1}, w_{2.j.1}, \cdots, w_{2.j.k}) = uH - \sum_* w_*Y_* \in \mathrm{Pic}(E_{(2.j.k)})$ as in (3.9) and (3.18). Put $h^p(u, w_1, \cdots) = \dim H^p(E_{(2.j.k)}, L(u, w_1, \cdots))$, $w =$*

1) $h^0(u,\cdots)=0$ *if* $\beta u<w$.
2) $h^1(u,\cdots)=0$ *and* $h^0(u,\cdots)=\frac{1}{2}(u+1)(u+2)-\sum_*\frac{1}{2}w_*(w_*+1)$ *if* $u\geq w_1+w_{2.1}$, $w_1\geq w_{2.1}+\cdots+w_{2.j-1}+w_{2.j.1}$, $w_{2.1}\geq\cdots\geq w_{2.j-1}\geq w_{2.j.1}+\cdots+w_{2.j.k}$ *and if* $w_{2.j.1}\geq\cdots\geq w_{2.j.k}$.
3) $h^0(u,\cdots)\leq\dfrac{1}{2}(u+1)(u+2)-\dfrac{1}{2\alpha\beta}(w+\dfrac{(2j-1)k+1}{2})^2+\dfrac{j+k}{8}$ *if* $w\leq\alpha u$.
4) $h^0(u,\cdots)\leq q(\beta u-w)$ *if* $w\leq\beta u$, *where* $q(\theta)=_{\rm def}\dfrac{1}{2\beta k}\theta^2+\dfrac{\beta+k+1}{2\beta k}\theta+1+\dfrac{j+k}{8}$.

Proof. The same method works as in (3.18), since we may assume $w_1\geq w_{2.1}+\cdots+w_{2.j-1}+w_{2.j.1}$, $w_{2.1}\geq\cdots\geq w_{2.j-1}\geq w_{2.j.1}+\cdots+w_{2.j.k}$ and $w_{2.j.1}\geq\cdots\geq w_{2.j.k}$. If $u\geq w_1+w_{2.1}$ further, then $\alpha u-w\geq\alpha w_{2.1}-k(w_{2.1}+\cdots+w_{2.j-1})-w_{2.j.1}-\cdots-w_{2.j.k}\geq w_{2.1}-w_{2.j.1}-\cdots-w_{2.j.k}\geq 0$. Details are left to the reader.

(3.29) Suppose that $\Xi_{(2.j.k)}\geq\gamma$ for some $\gamma=\gamma_{(2.j.k)}\leq 2\beta-k$. Then $\Xi_{(2.j.k)}(\pi_1^*B-xE)\geq\eta_\lambda(x)=\mathrm{Max}(0,\lambda(x-3)+\gamma)$ for some $\lambda>\dfrac{\gamma}{3}$. We will estimate $\psi(\lambda)=\int_{\eta_\lambda(x)\leq\alpha x}(\frac{1}{2}x^2-\frac{\eta_\lambda(x)^2}{2\beta\alpha})dx+\int_{\alpha x\leq\eta_\lambda(x)\leq\beta x}\frac{(\beta x-\eta_\lambda(x))^2}{2\beta k}dx$. Since $(3\alpha-\frac{2}{3}\gamma)-\frac{\gamma}{3}\geq\beta-2k=(j-2)k+1>0$, there are the following three cases as in (3.22):
1) $\frac{\gamma}{3}<\lambda\leq 3\alpha-\frac{2}{3}\gamma$. $6\psi(\lambda)=\int_0^{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}}3x^2dx+\int_{3-\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}}^{\frac{9}{2}}(3x^2-\frac{3\eta_\lambda(x)^2}{\alpha\beta})dx=\frac{729}{8}-\frac{1}{\alpha\beta\lambda}(\frac{3}{2}\lambda+\gamma)^3$.
2) $3\alpha-\frac{2}{3}\gamma\leq\lambda\leq 3\beta-\frac{2}{3}\gamma$. $6\psi(\lambda)=f_{\beta-k,\beta,\gamma}(\lambda)$.
3) $3\beta-\frac{2}{3}\gamma\leq\lambda$. $6\psi(\lambda)=(3\lambda-\gamma)^3/\lambda(\lambda-\beta+k)(\lambda-\beta)$.

As before, we easily checks that $\psi(\lambda)$ decreases in the range 1) and 3). In the range 2), by (3.11) we get $\varphi'''(c)=36(5\beta-13k+2\epsilon)$ and $\varphi'''(d)=36(5\beta+5k+2\epsilon)>0$ for $c=3\alpha-\frac{2}{3}\gamma$, $d=3\beta-\frac{2}{3}\gamma$ and $\epsilon=2\beta-k-\gamma\geq 0$. Hence φ''' is everywhere positive, or varies from $-$ to $+$. We have $\varphi''(c)=50\beta^2-404\beta k+482k^2+(40\beta-176k)\epsilon+8\epsilon^2$ and $\varphi''(d)=50\beta^2136\beta k+50k^2+40(\beta+k)\epsilon+8\epsilon^2>0$. Hence φ'' is everywhere positive, or varies from $-$ to $+$, or $+\to-\to+$. This last case can occur only when $\varphi'''(c)<0<\varphi''(c)$, so $5\beta<13k$ and $j=2$, $\beta=2k+1$, but then $\varphi''(c)=-126k^2-204k+50+(-96k+40)\epsilon+8\epsilon^2<0$ unless ϵ is very large. This case is thus ruled out if, e.g., $\epsilon<19$. We have $\varphi'(c)=-12k(11\beta-13k+2\epsilon)(\beta-2k+\epsilon)<0$ and $\varphi'(d)=18k\beta(\beta+k-2\epsilon)>0$ unless $2\epsilon>\beta+k=(j+1)k+1$, so usually φ' varies from $-$ to $+$. Since $\varphi(c)=-36k\alpha(\beta-2k+\epsilon)^2<0$ and $\varphi(d)=-9\beta k((4\beta^2-\beta k+4k^2)+8(\beta+k)\epsilon+4\epsilon^2)<0$, $\varphi<0$ in the range 2) if, e.g., $\epsilon\leq 3$.

Thus we usually obtain $\psi(\lambda)<\psi(\frac{\gamma}{3})=\frac{27}{16}(9-\frac{\gamma^2}{\alpha\beta})$. Hence

(3.30) $\pi_1^*B-\frac{9}{2}E$ *is big if* $\Xi_{(2.j.n)}>\gamma_{(2.j.n)}$ *and if* $(2j-1)n+2-\gamma_{(2.j.n)}\leq 3$, *where* $\gamma_{(2.j.n)}=\sqrt{321((j-1)n+1)(jn+1)}/9$.

(3.31) By (3.7) we have $1\leq\delta_{(2.j.k)}+m_{(2.j.k-1)}$, so $(2j-1)k+2\leq\mu_{(2.j.k)}+m_{(2.j.k-1)}$. Since $\mu_{(2.j.k)}=((j-1)k+1)m_{(1)}+k(m_{(2.1)}+\cdots+m_{(2.j-1)})+m_{(2.j.1)}+\cdots+m_{(2.j.k)}\geq(jk+1)(m_{(2.1)}+\cdots+m_{(2.j-1)})+((j-1)k+2)m_{(2.j.1)}+m_{(2.j.2)}+\cdots+m_{(2.j.k)}\geq(j-1)(jk+1)m_{(2.j-1)}+\cdots\geq((j-1)(jk+1)(k-1)+(j-1)k+2+(k-2))m_{(2.j.k-1)}=((j-1)jk^2-(j^2-3j+1)k+1-j)m_{(2.j.k-1)}$, we get

$$\mu_{(2.j.k)}\geq((2j-1)k+2)/\left(1+\frac{1}{(j-1)jk^2-(j^2-3j+1)k-j+1}\right).$$

As we will see later, this estimate is enough for (3.30) in most cases. But here is a danger.

(3.32) Even if we show that the above lower bound $\geq\sqrt{321\alpha\beta}/9$ for any k, this is not enough for our purpose ! Why so ?

We want to derive a contradiction assuming that $\pi_1^*B-\frac{9}{2}E$ is not big. Hence we may suppose $\Xi_{(2.j.k)}<\sqrt{321\alpha\beta}/9=\gamma$. But this does not mean $\mu_{(2.j.k)}<\gamma$. It means that if we replace the Hironaka model in (1.4) by another one of possibly larger degree, then $\mu_{(2.j.k)}<\gamma$ for this model. On this new model, $(2.j.k)$ cannot be an intermediate step of the blow-up

$(2.j.k')$ is an intermediate step for some $k' > k$. This place can be killed by replacing the Hironaka model, but then there might still other possibilities $(2.j.k'')$ with $k'' > k'$ survive. If such replacing processes repeat infinitely, we cannot complete the proof.

(3.33) In order to avoid the above danger, we will show that for each $j \leq 8$, there is a number n such that $\delta_{(2.j.n)} \geq \sqrt{321((j-1)n+1)(jn+1)}/9$ if $k \geq n$. Then, if we take a Hironaka model such that $\delta_{(2.j.n)} < \gamma_{(2.j.n)}$, then the above possibilities in (3.32) are killed for *all* $(2.j.k)$ with $k \geq n$ as (3.10;5) kills all the possibility (i) with $i \geq 5$ (cf. (3.13)).

(3.34) As a matter of fact, $n = 12$ has the above property.

To see this, we first note $2 \geq m_{(1)} \geq m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)} + m_{(2.j.1)} \geq (j-1)m_{(2.j-1)} + m_{(2.j.1)} \geq (j-1)(m_{(2.j.1)}+\cdots+m_{(2.j.k)})+m_{(2.j.1)} \geq ((j-1)(k-1)+1)m_{(2.j.k-1)}$, so $1-\delta_{(2.j.k)} \leq m_{(2.j.k-1)} \leq 2/((j-1)(k-1)+1) \leq \frac{2}{j}$ for any $k \geq 2$. Since $r_{(2.j.n)} = (2j-1)n+1$ for any n, we have $\mu_{(2.j.k)} \geq (2j-1)k+2-\frac{2}{j}$. We have $\mu_{(2.j.n)} = ((j-1)n+1)m_{(1)} + n(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + m_{(2.j.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.n)}$ for any n, so $\mu_{(2.j.n)} = \frac{n}{k}\mu_{(2.j.k)} + \frac{k-n}{k}m_{(1)} + \frac{k-n}{k}(m_{(2.j.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.n)} - \frac{n}{k}(m_{(2.j.n+1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.k)}) \geq \frac{n}{k}\mu_{(2.j.k)} + \frac{k-n}{k}m_{(1)}$ if $n \leq k$, since $m_{(2.j.1)} \geq \cdots \geq m_{(2.j.k)}$ implies $(m_{(2.j.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.n)})/n \geq (m_{(2.j.n+1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.k)})/(k-n)$. Therefore $\epsilon =_{\text{def}} 1-\delta_{(2.j.n)} = (2j-1)n+2-\mu_{(2.j.n)} \leq (2j-1)n+2-\frac{n}{k}((2j-1)k+2-\frac{2}{j}) - \frac{k-n}{k}m_{(1)} = \frac{k-n}{k}(2-m_{(1)}) + \frac{2n}{jk}$. In particular $\epsilon < 2-m_{(1)}+\frac{2}{j} < 3$, so it suffices to show $(2j-1)n+2-\epsilon \geq \sqrt{321((j-1)n+1)(jn+1)}/9$ by (3.30).

From $1 \leq \delta_{(2.j.k)} + m_{(2.j.k-1)}$ we get $(2j-1)k+2 \leq \mu_{(2.j.k)} + m_{(2.j.k-1)} = ((j-1)k+1)m_{(1)} + k(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + m_{(2.j.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.k)} + m_{(2.j.k-1)} \leq (jk+1)m_{(1)} - (k-1)m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2)} + \cdots + 2m_{(2.j.k-1)} + m_{(2.j.k)} \leq (jk+1)m_{(1)} + m_{(2.j.k)} \leq (jk+1+\frac{1}{(j-1)k+1})m_{(1)}$, hence $m_{(1)} \geq ((2j-1)k+2)/(jk+1+\frac{1}{(j-1)k+1})$ and $2-m_{(1)} \leq ((j-1)k^2+k+2)/(jk+1)((j-1)k+1) \leq \frac{1}{j}$ for any $k \geq 3$. Hence $\epsilon \leq 2-m_{(1)}+\frac{2}{j} \leq \frac{3}{j}$. For $n = 12$, this implies $2((2j-1)n+2)\epsilon < 4jn\epsilon \leq n^2$, which yields $(2j-1)n+2-\epsilon \geq 2\sqrt{((j-1)n+1)(jn+1)}$. This is more than enough.

(3.35) Now we consider the case $4 \leq k \leq 12$. By (3.31) we have $\epsilon =_{\text{def}} 1-\delta_{(2.j.k)}$
$= (2j-1)k+2-\mu_{(2.j.k)} \leq ((2j-1)k+2)/((j-1)jk^2-(j^2-3j+1)k-j+2)$
$= ((2j-1)k+2)/(jk+1)((j-1)(k-1)+1)$.

We claim $2((2j-1)k+2)^2 \leq k^2(jk+1)((j-1)(k-1)+1)$. This yields $k^2-2((2j-1)k+2)\epsilon \geq 0$, hence $\mu_{(2.j.k)} = (2j-1)k+2-\epsilon \geq 2\sqrt{((j-1)k+1)(jk+1)}$, which is more than enough.

To show the claim, we note $(j-1)(k-1)+1 > \frac{j-1}{j}\cdot\frac{k-1}{k}(jk+1)$ and $jk+1 > \frac{1}{2}((2j-1)k+2)$. Hence it suffices to show $2 \leq k^2\frac{1}{4}\frac{j-1}{j}\frac{k-1}{k}$, namely $8 \leq k(k-1)\frac{j-1}{j}$. Since $k \geq 4$ and $j \geq 2$, this is valid except $k = 4$ and $j = 2$. But in this last case the claim is verified by direct computation.

Thus we are done in this case.

(3.36) Here let $k = 3$. By (3.31) we have $\mu_{(2.j.k)} \geq (6j-1)(6j^2-j-2)/(3j+1)(2j-1)$, and further $> \sqrt{321(3j+1)(3j-2)}/9$ unless $j = 2$.

Thus, in the remaining cases we have $k = 2$ and $2 \leq j \leq 8$, or $(j,k) = (2,3)$.

(3.37) Suppose that $\delta_{(2.j.k)} \geq 1$. Then $\mu_{(2.j.k)} \geq (2j-1)k+2 = ((j-1)k+1)+(jk+1) \geq 2\sqrt{((j-1)k+1)(jk+1)}$, so (3.30) applies. Hence the blow-up process does not stop.

If it continues as (3.3;5), then $\mu_{(2.j.k)} \geq (j-1)(jk+1)m_{(2.j-1)} + ((j-1)k+2)m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.k)} \geq ((j-1)(jk+1)k + ((j-1)k+2) + k - 1)m_{(2.j.k)} = (jk+1)((j-1)k+1)m_{(2.j.k)} \geq \frac{6}{7}(jk+1)((j-1)k+1)$, which is more than enough to apply (3.30).

Thus the process must continue as (3.3;4). In this case $1 \leq \delta_{(2.j.k.\ell)} + m_{(2.j.k.\ell-1)}$ by (3.7).

(3.38) Here we consider the case $j = 2$, $k = 3$. Then $\mu_{(2.j.k)} = 4m_{(1)} + 3m_{(2.1)} + m_{(2.2.1)} + m_{(2.2.2)} + m_{(2.2.3.1)} \geq 7m_{(2.1)} + 5m_{(2.2.1)} + m_{(2.2.2)} + m_{(2.2.3.1)} \geq 12m_{(2.2.1)} + 8m_{(2.2.2)} +$

$m_{(2.2.3.\ell)}$, and $\delta_{(2.2.3.\ell)} = (3\ell+1)m_{(1)} + (2\ell+1)m_{(2.1)} + \ell(m_{(2.2.1)} + m_{(2.2.2)}) + m_{(2.2.3.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.2.3.\ell)} - (8\ell+2)$. Hence $8\ell+3 \leq (3\ell+1)m_{(1)} + (2\ell+1)m_{(2.1)} + \ell(m_{(2.2.1)} + m_{(2.2.2)}) + m_{(2.2.3.1)} + \cdots + 2m_{(2.2.3.\ell-1)} + m_{(2.2.3.\ell)} = \frac{3\ell+1}{4}\mu_{(2.2.3)} - \frac{\ell-1}{4}m_{(2.1)} + \frac{\ell-1}{4}(m_{(2.2.1)} + m_{(2.2.2)}) - \frac{3(\ell-1)}{4}m_{(2.2.3.1)} + m_{(2.2.3.2)} + \cdots + 2m_{(2.2.3.\ell-1)} + m_{(2.2.3.\ell)} \leq \frac{3\ell+1}{4}\mu_{(2.2.3)} - (\ell-1)m_{(2.2.3.1)} + m_{(2.2.3.2)} + \cdots + 2m_{(2.2.3.\ell-1)} + m_{(2.2.3.\ell)} \leq \frac{3\ell+1}{4}\mu_{(2.2.3)} + m_{(2.2.3.\ell)} \leq (\frac{3\ell+1}{4} + \frac{1}{20\ell+8})\mu_{(2.2.3)}$, so $\mu_{(2.2.3)} \geq (8\ell+3)/(\frac{3\ell+1}{4} + \frac{1}{20\ell+8}) = 4(8\ell+3)(5\ell+2)/(15\ell^2+11\ell+3) \geq \frac{32}{3} = 10.66\cdots$ for any $\ell \geq 2$. On the other hand $\sqrt{321((j-1)k+1)(jk+1)}/9 = 10.5\cdots$, so (3.30) applies.

(3.39) From now on we may asume $k = 2$. Then $r_{(2.j.2.\ell)} = 2j\ell + 2j + \ell - 2$, $\mu_{(2.j.2.\ell)} = (j\ell+j-1)m_{(1)} + (\ell+1)(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + \ell m_{(2/j/1)} + m_{(2.j.2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.2.\ell)}$ and $\mu_{(2.j.2)} = (2j-1)m_{(1)} + 2(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2)} \geq (2j+1)(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + 2jm_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.1)} \geq ((j-1)(2j+1)+2j)m_{(2.j.1)} + ((j-1)(2j+1)+1)m_{(2.j.2.1)} \geq (2j^2+j-1)(m_{(2.j.2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.2.\ell)}) + (2j^2-j)m_{(2.j.2.1)} \geq (2j-1)((j+1)\ell+j)m_{(2.j.2.\ell)}$. Hence $2j\ell + 2j + \ell - 1 \leq \mu_{(2.j.2.\ell)} + m_{(2.j.2.\ell-1)} = (j\ell+j-1)m_{(1)} + (\ell+1)(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + \ell m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.1)} + \cdots + 2m_{(2.j.2.\ell-1)} + m_{(2.j.2.\ell)} = \frac{j\ell+j-1}{2j-1}\mu_{(2.j.2)} - \frac{\ell-1}{2j-1}(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + \frac{(j-1)(\ell-1)}{2j-1}m_{(2.j.1)} - \frac{j(\ell-1)}{2j-1}m_{(2.j.2.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.2)} + \cdots + 2m_{(2.j.2.\ell-1)} + m_{(2.j.2.\ell)} \leq \frac{j\ell+j-1}{2j-1}\mu_{(2.j.2)} - (\ell-1)m_{(2.j.2.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.2)} + \cdots + 2m_{(2.j.2.\ell-1)} + m_{(2.j.2.\ell)} \leq \frac{j\ell+j-1}{2j-1}\mu_{(2.j.2)} + m_{(2.j.2.\ell)} \leq (\frac{j\ell+j-1}{2j-1} + \frac{1}{(2j-1)((j+1)\ell+j)})\mu_{(2.j.2)}$, so
$\mu_{(2.j.2)} \geq (2j-1)(2j\ell+2j+\ell-1)((j+1)\ell+j)/(j(j+1)\ell^2 + (2j^2-1)\ell + j^2 - j + 1)$.

(3.40) We divide the case s by j.

When $j = 8$, $\gamma_{(2.j.2)} = \sqrt{321(2j-1)(2j+1)}/9 = 31.789\cdots$. On the other hand $\mu_{(2.j.2)} \geq 15(17\ell+15)(9\ell+8)/(72\ell^2+127\ell+57) \geq \frac{255}{8} = 31.875$ for any $\ell \geq 2$ by (3.39), so (3.30) applies.

When $j = 7$, we have $\gamma_{(2.j.2)} = 27.798\cdots$ and $\mu_{(2.j.2)} \geq \frac{195}{7} = 27.85\cdots$ for any $\ell \geq 2$. When $j = 6$, $\gamma_{(2.j.2)} = 23.80\cdots$ and $\mu_{(2.j.2)}\frac{143}{6} = 23.83\cdots$. Thus we are done in these cases.

However, the situation is worse when $j \leq 5$. For $j = 5$, we have $\gamma_{(2.j.2)} = 19.807\cdots$, but $(2j-1)((2j+1)\ell + (2j-1))((j+1)\ell+j)/(j(j+1)\ell^2 + (2j^2-1)\ell + j^2 - j + 1) > \gamma_{(2.j.2)}$ if and only if $\ell \leq 45$. Thus the cases $j = 5$, $\ell \geq 46$ survive. Similarly, for $j = 4$, the cases $\ell \geq 5$ survive. For $j = 3, 2$, this method does not work for any ℓ.

(3.41) We will use (3.23) when ℓ is large. We have $\mu_{(2.j)} = jm_{(1)} + m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j)} \geq (j+1)(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)} + m_{(2.j.1)}) \geq (j+1)((j-1)m_{(2.j-1)} + m_{(2.j.1)}) \geq (j+1)((j-1)(m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.1)}) + m_{(2.j.1)}) \geq (j+1)(j(m_{(2.j.2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.2.\ell)}) + (j-1)m_{(2.j.2.1)}) \geq (j+1)(j(\ell-1)+j-1)m_{(2.j.2.\ell-1)} = (j+1)(j\ell-1)m_{(2.j.2.\ell-1)}$. Hence $1 \leq \delta_{(2.j.2.\ell)} + m_{(2.j.2.\ell-1)}$ implies $2j\ell+2j+\ell-1 \leq (j\ell+j-1)m_{(1)} + (\ell+1)(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + \ell m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.2.\ell-1)} + m_{(2.j.2.\ell)} \leq (\ell+1-\frac{1}{j})\mu_{(2.j)} + \frac{1}{j}(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) - \frac{j-1}{j}m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.1)} + \cdots \leq (\ell+1-\frac{1}{j}+\frac{1}{j(j+1)})\mu_{(2.j)} - m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.1)} + \cdots \leq (\ell+1-\frac{1}{j+1})\mu_{(2.j)} + m_{(2.j.2.\ell-1)} \leq (\ell + \frac{j}{j+1} + \frac{1}{(j+1)(j\ell-1)})\mu_{(2.j)}$, so $\mu_{(2.j)} \geq ((2j+1)\ell + 2j - 1)/(\ell + \frac{j}{j+1} + \frac{1}{(j+1)(j\ell-1)}) = (j+1)(j\ell-1)((2j+1)\ell+2j-1)/(j\ell+j-1)((j+1)\ell-1)$.

For $j = 2$, this implies $\mu_{(2.j)} \geq \sqrt{321j(j+1)}/9$ for $\ell \geq 4$, and (3.23) applies. This method works when ($j = 3$; $\ell \geq 4$), ($j = 4, 5, 6$; $\ell \geq 3$), ($j \geq 7$, $\ell \geq 2$).

(3.42) Combining (3.40) and (3.41), we are done except the following cases:
$(j, \ell) = (2, 2)$, $(2, 3)$, $(3, 2)$, $(3, 3)$.

In these cases we need a counterpart of (3.23), (3.30) in terms of $\Xi_{(2.j.2.\ell)}$. To begin with, let u, w_1, $w_{2.1}$, $\cdots$ be as before, and set $\alpha = j\ell + j - 1$, $\beta = j\ell + \ell + j$, $w = (j\ell+j-1)w_1 + (\ell+1)(w_{2.1} + \cdots + w_{2.j-1}) + \ell w_{2.j.1} + w_{2.j.2.1} + \cdots + w_{2.j.2.\ell}$ (compare $\mu_{(2.j.2.\ell)}$). Then
1) $h^0(u, \cdots) = 0$ if $\beta u < w$.
2) $h^1(u, \cdots) = 0$ if $u \geq w_1 + w_{2.1}$, $w_1 \geq w_{2.1} + \cdots + w_{2.j-1} + w_{2.j.1}$, $w_{2.1} \geq \cdots \geq w_{2.j-1} \geq$

3) $h^0(u,\cdots) \leq \frac{1}{2}(u+1)(u+2) - \frac{1}{2\alpha\beta}w^2 +$ (lower degree terms in w) if $w \leq \alpha u$.
4) $h^0(u,\cdots) \leq \frac{1}{2\beta(\beta-\alpha)}(\beta u - w)^2 +$ (lower degree terms in $\beta u - w$) if $w \leq \beta u$.

The proof is similar as before. Now if $\Xi_{(2.j.2.\ell)} \geq \gamma$, we have $\Xi_{(2.j.2.\ell)}(\pi_1^*B - xE) \geq \eta_\lambda(x) = \mathrm{Max}(0, \lambda(x-3)+\gamma)$ for some $\lambda \geq \gamma$, so we will estimate

$$\psi(\lambda) = \int_{\eta_\lambda(x)\leq\alpha x} \left(\frac{1}{2}x^2 - \frac{\eta_\lambda(x)^2}{2\alpha\beta}\right)dx + \int_{\alpha x\leq\eta_\lambda(x)\leq\beta x} \frac{(\beta x - \eta_\lambda(x))^2}{2\beta(\beta-\alpha)}dx$$

. As in (3.22) and (3.29), there are three cases:
1) $\frac{\gamma}{3} \leq \lambda \leq 3\alpha - \frac{2}{3}\gamma$. $6\psi(\lambda) = \frac{729}{8} - \frac{1}{\alpha\beta\lambda}(\frac{3}{2}\lambda+\gamma)^3$.
2) $3\alpha - \frac{2}{3}\gamma \leq \lambda \leq 3\beta - \frac{2}{3}\gamma$. $6\psi(\lambda) = f_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(\lambda)$ in (3.11).
3) $3\beta - \frac{2}{3}\gamma \leq \lambda$. $6\psi(\lambda) = (3\lambda-\gamma)^3/\lambda(\lambda-\alpha)(\lambda-\beta)$.

As before, $\psi(\lambda)$ decreases in the range 1) and 3). For $c = 3\alpha - \frac{2}{3}\gamma$ and $d = 3\beta - \frac{2}{3}\gamma$, we have by (3.11)
$\varphi'''(c) = 36((5j-8)\ell + 5j - 13 + 2\epsilon) > 0$,
$\varphi''(d) = 50\alpha^2 + 236(\beta-\alpha)\beta + 40(2\beta-\alpha)\epsilon + 8\epsilon^2 > 0$,
$\varphi'(c) = -(\ell+1)(11j\ell - 2\ell + 11j - 13 + 2\epsilon)(j\ell - \ell + j - 2 + \epsilon) < 0$,
$\varphi'(d) = 18(\ell+1)(j\ell+\ell+j)(j\ell+2\ell+j+1-2\ell) > 0$,
$\varphi(c) = -36\alpha(\beta-\alpha)(2\alpha-\beta+\epsilon)^2 < 0$ and
$\varphi(d) = -9\beta(\beta-\alpha)(4\alpha^2 + 7\beta(\beta-\alpha) + 8(2\beta-\alpha)\epsilon + 4\epsilon^2) < 0$
unless ϵ is very large. From this we infer that $\varphi < 0$ in the range 2). Hence $\psi(\lambda) \leq \psi(\frac{\gamma}{3}) = \frac{27}{16}(9 - \frac{\gamma^2}{\alpha\beta})$. Thus we conclude

(3.43) *$\pi_1^*B - \frac{9}{2}E$ is big if $\Xi_{(2.j.2.\ell)} \geq \sqrt{321\alpha\beta}/9$, where $\alpha = j\ell + j - 1$ and $\beta = j\ell + \ell + j$.*

(3.44) We have $\mu_{(2.j.2.\ell)} = \alpha m_{(1)} + (\ell+1)(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + \ell m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.2.\ell)} \geq (\alpha+\ell+1)(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + (\alpha+\ell)m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.2.\ell)} \geq \beta(j-1)m_{(2.j-1)} + (\beta-1)m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.2.\ell)} \geq (\beta j - 1)m_{(2.j.1)} + (\beta j - \beta + 1)m_{(2.j.2.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.2)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j.2.\ell)} \geq ((\beta j - 1)(\ell-1) + \beta j - \beta + \ell - 1)m_{(2.j.2.\ell-1)} = \beta(\alpha - j)m_{(2.j.2.\ell-1)}$. Hence $1 \leq \delta_{(2.j.2.\ell)} + m_{(2.j.2.\ell-1)}$ implies $\mu_{(2.j.2.\ell)} \geq (\alpha+\beta)/(1 + \frac{1}{\beta(\alpha-j)} = (\alpha+b)\beta(\alpha-j)/\alpha(\beta - j - 1)$. Therefore (3.43) applies when $\ell = 3$ and $j = 2, 3$. But the case $\ell = 2$ still survive.

(3.45) Similarly as in (3.37), we infer that the blow-up process continues via $E_{(2.j.2.2.n)}$ for some $n \geq 2$.

$$(1) - (2.j.1) - (2.j.2.2.1) - \cdots - (2.j.2.2.n) - (2.j.2.1) - (2.j-1) - \cdots - (2.1)$$

We have $\mu_{(2.j.2)} = (2j-1)m_{(1)} + 2(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + m_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.1)} \geq (2j+1)(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + 2jm_{(2.j.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.1)} \geq ((j-1)(2j+1)+2j)m_{(2.j.1)} + ((j-1)(2j+1)+1)m_{(2.j.2.1)} \geq (2j+1)(2j-1)m_{(2.j.2.1)} + ((j-1)(2j+1)+2j)m_{(2.j.2.2.1)} \geq ((2j+1)(2j-1)(n-1) + 2j^2 + j - 1)m_{(2.j.2.2.n-1)} = (2j-1)((2j+1)n - j)m_{(2.j.2.2.n-1)}$. Hence $1 \leq \delta_{(2.j.2.2.n)} + m_{(2.j.2.2.n-1)}$ implies $4jn + 2j + 1 \leq ((2j-1)n + j)m_{(1)} + (2n+1)(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + (n+1)m_{(2.j.1)} + nm_{(2.j.2.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.2.n-1)} + \cdots + 2m_{(2.j.2.2.n-1)} + m_{(2.j.2.2.n)} \leq (n + \frac{j}{2j-1})\mu_{(2.j.2)} - \frac{1}{2j-1}(m_{(2.1)} + \cdots + m_{(2.j-1)}) + \frac{j-1}{2j-1}m_{(2.j.1)} - \frac{j}{2j-1}m_{(2.j.2.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.2.1)} + \cdots \leq (n + \frac{j}{2j-1})\mu_{(2.j.2)} - m_{(2.j.2.1)} + m_{(2.j.2.2.1)} + \cdots \leq (n + \frac{j}{2j-1})\mu_{(2.j.2)} + m_{(2.j.2.2.n-1)} \leq (n + \frac{j}{2j-1} + \frac{1}{(2j-1)((2j+1)n-j)})\mu_{(2.j.2)}$, so $\mu_{(2.j.2)} \geq (2j-1)(4jn+2j+1)((2j+1)n - j)/((2j+1)n + j + 1)((2j-1)n - j + 1)$.

For $j = 3$, $\mu \geq 5(12n+7)(7n-3)/(7n+4)(5n-2) =_{\mathrm{def}} \varphi(n)$. Since $\frac{d}{dn}\log\varphi = (49n^2 + 126n + 22)/(12n+7)(7n-3)(7n+4)(5n-2) > 0$, we have $\varphi(n) \geq \varphi(2) = \frac{1705}{144} = 11.84\cdots$. On the other hand $\sqrt{321(2j-1)(2j+1)}/9 = 11.77\cdots$, so this case is ruled out by (3.30).

For $j = 2$, we have $\mu \geq 3(8n+5)(5n-2)/(5n+3)(3n-1) =_{\mathrm{def}} \varphi(n)$. Similarly $\frac{d}{dn}\log\varphi > 0$

this case is ruled out either.

§4. Concluding remarks

(4.1) Combining the observations in preceding sections, we can now complete the proof of the following

Theorem. *Let B be a nef and big line bundle on a smooth threefold M. Let K be the canonical bundle and x be a point on M. Suppose that $BC \geq 3$ for any curve $C \ni x$, $B^2S \geq 7$ for any surface $S \ni x$ and $B^3 \geq 51$. Then $K + B$ is spanned at x.*

In the proof, we should pay attention to the danger (3.32). We argue as follows.

For the sake of simplicity, at first, we make the assumption below:

$$(*) \qquad \mathrm{Bs}|s(\pi_1^*B - \epsilon E)| \cap E = \emptyset \text{ for some } \epsilon > 0 \text{ and } s \gg 0.$$

In such a case $\Xi_P(\pi_1^*B - \epsilon E) = 0$ at any place P of E, so the assertions in (3.23), (3.30) etc. are valid even if $\Xi_P = \sqrt{321\alpha\beta}/9$, since $\lambda > \frac{\gamma}{3}$.

Assume that $x \in \mathrm{Bs}|K + B|$. Then $\pi_1^*B - \frac{9}{2}E$ is not big by Theorem 0. Take a Hironaka decomposition as in (1.4). There are only finitely many non-exceptional bad places. By the results in §2, we can replace the Hironaka model by another one having no non-exceptional bad places.

Let us call the union of the loci of bad places as "bad locus", and a point on it as a "bad point". This notion may depend on the degree of the Hironaka model, but it does not depend on the choice of the model $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{M} \longrightarrow M$. Moreover, if we replace the model by another one whose degree is a multiple of the older one, then the new bad locus is a subset of the older one. In particular, no new bad place appear by such a replacement.

There are at most finitely many bad points $p_1, \cdots, p_n$ on $E \cong \mathbb{P}^2$. By (3.10;1), we can choose a Hironaka model of degree τ such that $\mu_{(1)} = \tau^{-1}v_{p_j}(\tau|\pi_1^*B - 3E|) < 1.99072$ at each point p_j. Then the primary place $\mathcal{P}(Y_{(1)})$ over p_j is not bad, so the bad locus on the (-1)-curve $Y_{(1)}$ over p_j is a finite set. By (3.10;2), we can choose a model such that $\mu_{(2)} < 2.81531$ at any such points on $Y_{(1)}$ over p_j. Let $Y_{(2)}$ be the (-1)-curve over a bad point on $Y_{(1)}$. Then $\mathcal{P}(Y_{(2)})$ is not a bad place, so there are only finitely many bad points on it. By (3.10;3), we may assume $\mu_{(3)} < 3.51$ at every such point. Similarly, there appear only finitely many bad points by such a blowing-up, so we may assume $\mu_{(4)} < 4.23$ and $\mu_{(5)} < 5$ by (3.10).

If $\tilde{Y}_{(2)} \cap Y_{(3)}$ is a bad point, we apply (3.19) and assume $\mu_{(3.2)} < 6.31$, $\mu_{(3.3)} < 9.13$ and $\mu_{(3.4)} < 12$ at every bad point of this type. Similarly, if $\tilde{Y}_{(1)} \cap Y_{(2)}$ is a bad point, we arrange things so that
$\mu_{(2.j)} < \sqrt{321j(j+1)}/9$ for any $j \leq 108$ (cf. (3.23)),
$\mu_{(2.j.k)} < \sqrt{321((j-1)k+1)(jk+1)}/9$ for any $j \leq 8$, $k \leq 12$ (cf. (3.30)),
$\mu_{(2.j.2.\ell)} < \sqrt{321(j\ell+j-1)(j\ell+\ell+j)}/9$ for any $j \leq 3$, $\ell \leq 3$.
Up to this step, there are only finitely many places involved.

Now, by the argument in §3, we infer that there are no bad places on such a model. Hence (1.6) applies.

Even if the hypothesis $(*)$ is not true, we may assume that the numbers $\mu_{(2.j)}$, $\mu_{(2.j.k)}$ and $\mu_{(2.j.2.\ell)}$ are bounded from above by numbers just slightly bigger than $\sqrt{321\alpha\beta}/9$, which are enough for the later argument in §3. Thus the same method works to complete the proof.

(4.2) **Corollary.** *$K + 3L$ is spanned if L is an ample line bundle with $L^3 > 1$.*

(4.3) By the same method we can prove the following

Theorem. *Let (M, Δ) be a log threefold having only log terminal singularities. Let A be a*

is the log canonical $\mathbb{Q}$-bundle of (M, Δ). Let x be a smooth point on M off Δ such that $BC \geq 3$ for any curve $C \ni x$, $B^2S \geq 7$ for any surface $S \ni x$ and $B^3 \geq 51$. Then A is spanned at x.

Probably the last assumption can be replaced by a weaker one $B^3 \geq d$, as long as $d > 50.625$, if one works harder than in this paper. Any way, we can hardly think that these numbers 51 or 50.625 are optimal. For, $\pi_1^*B - 3E$ is big if $B^3 > 27$, so $x \in \mathrm{Bs}|L|$ implies in this case that $\pi_1^*B - 3E$ fails to be nef. Hence there exists some troublesome subvariety containing x. A better understanding of the nature of it will yield a better numerical criterion of spannedness. A true optimist may hope that it is enough to assume $BC \geq 3$, $B^2S \geq 9$ and $B^3 > 27$.

Probably there is a similar numerical criterion even if x is a singular point on (M, Δ).

(4.4) The method in this paper will be used in a forthcoming paper to study the very ampleness of $K + B$. I hope that the idea may have some value in higher dimensions too.

References

[[**Dem1**]] J.-P. Demailly, *Singular hermitian metrics on positive line bundles*, Complex Algebraic Varieties; Proc. Bayreuth 1990, Lecture Notes in Math. (Springer), **1507**, 1992, pp. 87–104.

[[**Dem2**]] ———, *A numerical criterion for very ample line bundles*, preprint.

[[**EL**]] L. Ein and R. Lazarsfeld, *Global generation of pluricanonical and adjoint linear series on smooth projective threefolds*, preprint.

[[**F**]] T. Fujita, *Semipositive line bundles*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. of Tokyo **30** (1983), 353–378.

[[**Kol**]] J. Kollar, *Effective base point freeness*, preprint.

[[**R**]] I. Reider, *Vector bundles of rank 2 and linear systems on algebraic surfaces*, Ann. of Math. **127** (1988), 309–316.

[[**T**]] H. Tsuji, *Analytic Zariski decomposition*, preprint.

Takao FUJITA
Department of Mathematics
Tokyo Institute of Technology
Oh-okayama, Meguro, Tokyo
152 Japan
e-mail:fujita@math.titech.ac.jp